UNCLASSIFIED
AD NUMBER
AD873253
LIMITATION CHANGES
TO: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.
FROM: Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Critical Technology; MAR 1970. Other requests shall be referred to U.S. Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Fort Eustis, Virginia 23604. This document contains export-controlled technical data.
AUTHORITY
USAAMRDL ltr, 18 Jun 1971
ODAMINDE TOT, TO OUIT 19/1

Best Available Copy

M

USAAVLABS TECHNICAL REPORT 69-98

MEASUREMENT OF AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON AN OSCILLATING AIRFOIL



AD NO.

i

By

Richard I. Windsor

March 1970

U. S. ARMY AVIATION MATERIEL LABORATORIES FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

CONTRACT DAAJ02-67-C-0017
WIND TUNNEL OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

This document is subject to special export controls, and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of US Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Fort Eustis, Virginia 23604.





26


Disclaimers

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the United States Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission, to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

Disposition Instructions

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.





.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

HEADQUARTERS US ARMY AVIATION MATERIEL LABORATORIES
FORT EUSTIS. VIRGINIA 23604

This report has been reviewed by the U. S. Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories and is considered to be technically sound. The report is published for the exchange of information and the stimulation of ideas.

Task 1F162204A13903 Contract DAAJ02-67-C-0017 USAAVLABS Technical Report 69-98 March 1970

MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON AN OSCILLATING AIRFOIL

Final Report
Engineering Report No. 70-1

By Richard I. Windsor

Prepared by

Wind Tunnel Operations Department University of Maryland College Park, Maryland

for

U. S. ARMY AVIATION MATERIEL LABORATORIES FORT EUSTIS, VIRGINIA

This document is subject to special export controls, and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of U. S. Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Fort Eustis, Virginia 23604.

SUMMARY

A literature survey was conducted to determine the state of the art of measuring and predicting aerodynamic characteristics of oscillating airfoils. Results of this survey are presented in Appendix I as a correlation and tabulation of airfoil and finite wing experimental investigations. An extensive bibliography resulting from the literature survey is also presented.

Aerodynamic forces on a two-dimensional NACA 0012 airfoil oscillating sinusoidally in pitch were measured by two techniques. The forces were obtained from pressure measurements and by means of strain gage balances. Pressure measurements were made on the airfoil oscillating in pitch about the quarter-chord point at various mean angles of attack. Strain gage balance readings were obtained for models with pitch axis located at 25, 37, and 50 percent chord points oscillating about various mean angles. Direct force measurements were employed in an effort to obtain drag data.

Test results obtained by the two measuring techniques exhibit excellent agreement over the test range of oscillating frequencies. At low mean angles where the instantaneous angle of attack does not exceed the steady state stall angle of attack, the data compare very well with incompressible theory. At higher mean angles, the pitch oscillations were found to increase the stall angle of attack with corresponding increase in the normal force and pitching moment coefficients. Mean values of drag were found to increase with increasing oscillating frequency. The oscillatory amplitude of drag tended to decrease as oscillating frequency increased.

Instantaneous pressure distributions are presented for representative oscillating conditions.

ŧ

FOREWORD

The results from the oscillating airfoil tests are presented in this report. The project was performed under Contract DAAJ02-67-C-0017 (Task 1F162204A13903) under the technical cognizance of Patrick Cancro, Project Engineer, U. S. Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories.

The cooperation and assistance of Stanley E. Pearson of NASA-Langley Research Center with the pressure instrumentation are gratefully acknowledged.




TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY		•		iii
FOREWORD		•		v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS		٠		vii
LIST OF TABLES		•		xi
LIST OF SYMBOLS		•	•	xi
INTRODUCTION		•		1
LITERATURE SURVEY				3
EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM		•		4
Description of Apparatus				
RESULTS AND COMPARISON OF DATA				14
Steady State Results	•	•	• •	15 17
CONCLUSIONS		•		26
RECOMMENDATIONS				29
LITERATURE CITED				83
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY				88
APPENDIXES I Correlation of Oscillating Airfoil Data . II Effect of Tubing on the Remote Reading	•	•		99
of Oscillating Pressures				
DISTRIBUTION				

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
1	Oscillating Drive Mechanism Mounted Under the Test Section of the 1.5-Foot by 3.875-Foot Wind Tunnel	30
2	View With Tunnel Wall Removed of Force Model (Axis at 50% Chord) Installed in Test Section	31
3	Details of Pressure Transducer Installation	32
4	Strain Gage Force Balance, Gage Locations	33
5	Strain Gage Electrical Connections	34
6	Static C_N and C_M Characteristics	35
7	Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Pressure Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord	36
8	Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Pressure Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord	37
9	Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M , $\bar{\alpha}$ = 13.80°	38
10	Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and $C_{M'}$, $\bar{\alpha} = 18^{\circ}$.	42
11	Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\alpha = 10.05^{\circ}$, $\bar{\alpha} = 5.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.0^{\circ}$, $k = .032$	46
12	Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\alpha = 10.16^{\circ}$, $\bar{\alpha} = 5.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.17^{\circ}$, $k = .268 \dots$	47
13	Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha} = 13.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.02^{\circ}$, $k = .032 \dots$	48
14	Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha} = 13.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.07^{\circ}$, $k = .123 \dots$.	50
15	Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha} = 13.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.17^{\circ}$, $k = .266 \dots$	52

Figure		Page
16	Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 18.00°, $\Delta \alpha$ = 617°, k = .266	54
17	Instantaneous Lower Surface Leading Edge Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 5.80°	58
18	Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch. Pitch Axis at 25% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$.	59
19	Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$	60
20	Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 37% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$	61
21	Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 37% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$	62
22	Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 50% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$	63
23	Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 50% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$	64
24	Variation of Drag Coefficient With Reduced Frequency, $\bar{\alpha} \approx 0^{\circ} \dots \dots \dots$	65
25	Variation of Drag Coefficient With Reduced Frequency, $\bar{\alpha} \approx 6^{\circ} \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots$	66
26	Dynamic C_N and C_M for 50% Pitch Axis Model Oscillating at Low Frequency About $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6.22°, k = .032, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.30°	68
27	Dynamic C_N and C_M for 50% Pitch Axis Model Oscillating at High Frequency About $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6.22°, k = .297, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.38°	69

Figure		Page
28	Variation of Normal Force Mean Values With Reduced Frequency	70
29	Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M , Pitch Axis = 25% Chord, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 13.56°	71
30	Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M , Pitch Axis = 37% Chord, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 13.76°	75
31	Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M , Pitch Axis = 50% Chord, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 14.25°	79
32	Reynolds Number Effect - Lift in Pure Pitch	111
33	Reynolds Number Effect - Moment in Pure Pitch	112
34	Airfoil Profile Effect - Lift in Pure Pitch, $\bar{\alpha} = 0^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$, Pitch Axis = 37% Chord	113
35	Airfoil Profile Effect - Moment in Pure Pitch, $\bar{\alpha} = 0^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$, Pitch Axis = 37% Chord	114
36	Effect of Airfoil Thickness - Lift in Pure Pitch, M = .491, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 2°, Pitch Axis = 25% Chord	115
37	Effect of Thickness Distribution - Lift in Pure Pitch, M = .491, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 2°, Pitch Axis = 25% Chord	116
38	Pressure Attenuation, Influence of Tube Length, Using Scanivalve, Mean Pressure Amplitude 61 in. H ₂ 0, Tube Diameter 0.049 in	
39	Phase Lag, Influence of Tube Length, Using Scanivalve, Mean Pressure Amplitude 61 in. H ₂ 0, Tube Diameter 0.049 in	122
40	Pressure Attenuation, Influence of Tube Length and Pressure Amplitude, Tube Diameter 0.049 in	125
41	Phase Lag, Influence of Tube Length and Pressure Amplitude, Tube Diameter 0.049 in	126
42	Variation of Phase Lag Over a Cycle	127

Figure		Page
43	Sample of Actual Pressure Versus Crank Position, Flush-Mounted Piston Transducer	128
44	Pressure Attenuation, Short Tubing Length (6 in.)	129
45	Phase Lag, Short Tubing Length (6 in.)	130

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		Page
1	Summary of Test Conditions	9
II	Oscillating Airfoil, Summary of Low-Speed Experimental Investigations	103
ш	Oscillating Airfoil, Summary of Compressible Flow Experimental Investigations	105
IV	Oscillating Wing, Summary of Low-Speed Experimental Investigations	107
v	Oscillating Wing, Summary of Compressible Flow Experimental Investigations	109

LIST OF SYMBOLS

С	wing chord, ft
C _A	airfoil axial force coefficient, positive downstream
c_{D}	airfoil drag coefficient, positive downstream
$c_{\mathtt{L}}$	airfoil lift coefficient, positive up
$\left \frac{dC_L}{d\alpha} \right $	absolute magnitude of fundamental component of oscillating airfoil lift coefficient per radian
C _M	airfoil pitching moment coefficient about pitch axis, positive nose up
$\frac{dC_{\mathbf{M}}}{d\alpha}$	absolute magnitude of fundamental component of oscillating airfoil pitching moment coefficient per radian
C_{N}	airfoil normal force coefficient, positive up
$\left \frac{dC_{N}}{d\alpha} \right $	absolute magnitude of fundamental component of oscillating airfoil normal force coefficient per radian
$C_{\mathbf{p}}$	pressure coefficient
f	frequency, Hertz
k ·	reduced frequency, $\omega C/2V$
М	absolute magnitude of fundamental component of oscillating pitching moment about pitch axis, ft-lb
N	absolute magnitude of fundamental component of oscillating normal force, lb
q	dynamic pressure, pounds per square ft
R	Reynolds number
S	model area (span x chord), sq ft

V	velocity, fps
x	airfoil chordwise coordinate, measured from leading edge, ft
α	instantaneous angle of attack, deg
Δα	oscillatory angle of attack, deg (except when used in defining oscillatory derivatives)
ā	mean angle of attack about which airfoil is oscillated, deg
ρ	density, slugs per cubic ft
$^{arphi}_{ m L}$	phase angle by which lift leads the motion, deg
$^{oldsymbol{arphi}}$ M	phase angle by which pitching moment leads the motion, deg
φ_{N}	phase angle by which normal force leads the motion, deg
ω	circular frequency, 2 mf, rad per sec
	Bars indicate mean value over an oscillation cycle

INTRODUCTION

In the past, considerable effort has been expended, both theoretically and experimentally, to determine the aerodynamic characteristics of oscillating airfoils. A survey of the literature in this field was undertaken to determine the state of the art and the extent of previous experimental investigations. The primary emphasis of the survey was placed upon experimental investigations of two-dimensional oscillating airfoils. An attempt to correlate the results of these investigations was undertaken.

Results of the survey indicated two major problem areas in experimental oscillating airfoil investigations: that of obtaining the desired motion and that of measuring the aerodynamic forces. In regard to the first problem, the motions of primary interest in the past have been pure sinusoidal rotation about the pitch axis, pure sinusoidal translation, and a combination of those two. One reason for interest in sinusoidal motion was that it could be compared with existing theory. Recently there has been an interest in a combined rotational and translational motion which would simulate the motion experienced by a section of a helicopter rotor blade as it rotates. There were no experimental results uncovered during the literature search dealing with this particular problem. In the past, some rather ingenious devices have been used in an effort to overcome the problem of measuring the aerodynamic forces. The methods used fall mainly into two categories: that of measuring forces directly and that of measuring pressures and obtaining forces by integration. Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages. In order to investigate measuring techniques, an experimental test was undertaken using sinusoidal motion.

Aerodynamic forces on an NACA 0012 airfoil oscillating sinusoidally in pitch were measured by two techniques. The forces were obtained from pressure measurements and by means of strain gage balances. By using two methods of obtaining the oscillating forces, the advantages, disadvantages, and limitations of the methods could be compared while keeping the airfoil profile, test installation, and testing techniques consistent. Pressure measurements were made on the airfoil oscillating in pitch about the quarter-chord point at various mean angles of attack. Strain gage balance readings were obtained with the model oscillating about pitch-axis locations of 25, 37, and 50 percent chord for various mean angles.

Results obtained from the two methods are compared with each other and with two-dimensional, incompressible flow, oscillating airfoil theory. Testing at different pitch-axis locations allowed an extension of the comparison with theory and correlation with the work of other experimenters.

Mean angles were chosen so that in some cases the airfoils were oscillating in and out of the stall condition. There is no satisfactory theory for this condition, but it is a situation that arises in helicopter rotors where, at certain azimuth locations, portions of the rotor blade exceed the stall angle of attack. While the Mach number and Reynolds number employed in the experimental investigation may be somewhat low for application to helicopter rotor theory, the oscillating characteristics presented for the stall region and the instantaneous pressure distributions obtained may offer some insight into the rotor problem.

LITERATURE SURVEY

A literature survey was conducted to determine the state of the art of measuring and predicting aerodynamic characteristics of oscillating wings and airfoils. During the course of the literature survey, it became evident that considerable effort has gone into the investigation of unsteady aerodynamics. A complete coverage of this field is beyond the scope of this report. Therefore, the primary thrust of the survey was directed toward determining what had been done in the area of two-dimensional oscillating airfoil investigations. This information was needed to provide a background for the experimental investigation of techniques for determining the aerodynamic forces on an oscillating airfoil. The scope of the survey was wider than that dictated by the ultimate experimental effort, in order to provide the following:

- 1. A bibliography covering the entire topic of oscillating wings and airfoils (subsonic, compressible, nonuniform flows, etc.).
- 2. Background information on the experimental techniques of unsteady aerodynamic measurements employed by various investigators.
- 3. Theoretical means for predicting results.

Results of the literature survey are presented in Appendix I and the Selected Bibliography. Appendix I presents an attempt to correlate the results of various low-speed investigations of oscillating two-dimensional airfoils and a summary of airfoil and finite wing experimental investigations. Due to the large number of parameters involved in the investigations (oscillating frequency, oscillating amplitude, mean angle of attack, test Reynolds number, airfoil profile and pitch-axis location) and the type of data reported, it was quite difficult to make any direct comparisons or correlation. All reports resulting from the literature survey which are not included in the summary of Appendix I are listed in the Selected Bibliography.

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

An experimental program was conducted to measure the aerodynamic forces on a two-dimensional airfoil undergoing forced sinusoidal oscillations in a wind tunnel. The forces were determined by means of pressure measurements and direct force measurements using strain gage balances. A NACA 0012 profile was chosen for the airfoil so that results could be compared with previous experimental investigations.

DESCRIPTION OF APPARATUS

Test Facility

Tests were conducted in a two-dimensional open circuit wind tunnel. This tunnel has a capebility of 110 mph velocity through a 1.5-foot by 3.875-foot test section. These dimensions are one-half scale of the 3-foot by 7.75-foot test section of the University of Maryland 7.75-foot by 11-foot low-speed wind tunnel. The velocity distribution in the test section is very uniform, with a variation of less than 0.5 percent of the mean velocity in the test region. The turbulence factor as determined by a 4.5-inch sphere is 1.08.

Oscillating Mechanism

An oscillating drive mechanism was designed to meet the following requirements:

- 1. Oscillate the model in pure rotation (pitch).
- 2. Oscillate the model in pure translation (heave).
- 3. Oscillate the model in a combination of rotation and translation.
- 4. Be adaptable to the 1.5-foot by 3.875-foot wind tunnel and the 3-foot by 7.75-foot test section of the larger wind tunnel.

The literature survey established the following design capabilities:

1. Rotation

- a. Frequency range, 2 to 30 Hertz
- b. Amplitude of 10 degrees from mean angle of attack

2. Translation

- a. Frequency range, 2 to 30 Hertz
- b. Amplitude of 5 inches

These design requirements and capabilities were greater than the dictates of the immediate experimental program. Details of the design are presented in a separate report. A brief summary and principles of operation are presented here for convenience.

In order to meet the requirements of pure rotation, pure translation, and combined motion, the oscillator was constructed with separate pitch and heave shafts with the capability of gearing them together for combined motion. The shafts have flywheels on each end with adjustable crank pins driving Scotch-yoke arrangements. Thus, the two-dimensional model is driven from both ends. This eliminates twist of the model that may exist if it is driven from one end only. The flywheels were designed to maintain a speed variation of less than 2 percent at the top oscillating speed of 30 Hertz. The crank pin had a maximum travel of 5.0 inches from the centerline of the shaft. This travel was sufficient to provide the design rotation and translation amplitudes. The pitch and heave shafts were driven by a 10-horsepower variable-speed motor drive. This drive provided oscillating frequency ranges of 2 to 15 Hertz and 4 to 30 Hertz.

The oscillating mechanism was designed to be mounted under the test section of the small two-dimensional tunnel. The forward or heave shaft was directly under and parallel to the model pitch axis. The heave motion was transmitted by a vertical shaft attached to the Scotch-yoke. The rear or pitch shaft was located 18 inches downstream from the heave shaft. The pitching motion was transferred to the model by means of a vertical shaft connected to the Scotch-yoke mechanism and a pitch arm connecting the vertical shaft to the model pitch axis. In order to insure sinusoidal motion, the pitch arm was fitted with a cam follower which rode in a horizontal slot attached to the top of the vertical pitch member. The general arrangement of the drive mechanism, 1.5-foot by 3.875-foot wind tunnel, and model is shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 illustrates the details of the pitch mechanism.

Model Construction and Instrumentation

There are two main considerations in the design of airfoils for forced oscillation testing. First, the weight must be held to a minimum to reduce the inertia loads, and second, the structure should be rigid to keep deflections as small as possible. These two requirements are in opposition to each other, and a reasonable trade-off between the two is required.

In an effort to meet these requirements, it was decided to construct the models from plastic foam. For this purpose, a wooden airfoil of NACA 0012 profile having a 1-foot chord and a 1.5-foot span was constructed. A plaster mold was cast from this model. With this mold it became a simple matter to make models using a foam-in-place rigid plastic. The result was a lightweight rigid model having a very smooth surface. The first models made by this method were somewhat unstable. That is, the profile shape changed after a period of time. This problem was overcome by allowing the models to cure in the mold for several days. Several models were cast. Some were used for checking out the method and improving upon the technique. Four were constructed for the experimental investigation. The models used during the tests consisted of one pressure model and three force models. These models are discussed in the following sections:

Pressure Model

Model weight is not as serious a problem for the pressure model as it is for the force models. Whereas the inertia loads arising from the model weight do impose a burden on the drive mechanism, they do not affect the forces obtained from the integration of the pressure readings. Therefore, the limiting weight factor is the capacity of the drive system. This is fortunate since other problems, such as mounting pressure transducers, arise in conjunction with the pressure model that tend to increase the inertia loads.

In determining forces from pressure measurements, ten orifices on both upper and lower surfaces were considered to be a minimum number for the accuracy desired. If forces are the only interest, then differential pressure transducers could be used and only ten would be required. However, if instantaneous pressure distributions are desired, twenty transducers would be needed. Since transducers and their associated instrumentation are expensive and such large numbers are difficult to mount in small models, it was felt that any method of reducing the number of transducers required was worthy of consideration.

One method of reducing the number of transducers required that appeared promising was the use of a scanning valve with a single transducer. This would require pressure tubing running from each orifice on the model to the scanning valve. To employ such a method would require a knowledge of the pressure attenuation and phase lag associated with the system. In order to acquire this knowledge, an investigation of the effects of tubing on the remote reading of oscillating pressures was undertaken. The report of this investigation is presented in Appendix II. It was concluded from the investigation that

it would be impractical to determine the instantaneous local oscillating pressure from remote readings using this method.

For this investigation, it was desired to obtain instantaneous pressure distributions. Twenty-four differential pressure transducers of the NACA type described by Patterson² were used, twelve on the upper surface and twelve on the lower surface. A Statham Model PL131TC transducer was employed to obtain the leading edge pressure, resulting in a total of 25 pressure orifices. The range of these transducers was ± 2 psid. An aluminum block was machined to receive the NACA type transducers in two rows of twelve each, stacked one transducer over the other, connected on the reference pressure side to a common reference pressure passage. The transducers were placed in the block and secured by a cover plate which contained short tubes leading to the pressure orifices on the model surface. Details of this installation are presented in Figure 3. This block containing the pressure transducers was mounted at the midspan point of the pitch-axis shaft. The shaft and the transducer block were then positioned in the mold, and the model was cast around them. The tubing for the pressure orifices was then worked down to the model contour. Thus, the transducers were embedded in the model and and could not be removed without destroying the model itself. The pressure orifices were located at 0, 0.75, 2, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 35, 45, 60, 75, and 90 percent chord. The transducer for the leading edge orifice was mounted in the model separately from the other transducers but was connected to the common reference pressure.

Prior to installing the transducers in the model, the system was checked for leaks and feedback through the reference pressure passage. That is, the system was checked to insure that oscillating pressures at one transducer did not interfere with pressures recorded on adjacent transducers. This was checked by connecting all orifices except one to an oscillating pressure (motor-driven piston) of the maximum anticipated test pressure and observing the output signal of the remaining transducer. There was no discernible interaction observed.

Commercially available carrier equipment was used with the transducers to drive recording galvanometers. Two recorders were used, one for the upper surface pressures and the other for the lower surface and leading edge pressures. The frequency response of the galvanometers was flat up to 60 Hertz. The frequency response of the transducers was equal to or better than the galvanometers.

Force Model

Force models were constructed with pitch-axis locations of 25, 37, and 50 percent chord. Construction of these models was relatively simple. A spar was machined from 1/2-inch aluminum plate, located in the mold to provide proper pitch-axis location, and the plastic foam was poured around the spar to form the model. Each spar was designed so that the combined weight of the spar and plastic foam would locate the model center of gravity very nearly on the pitch axis.

To measure the aerodynamic forces on these models, two strain gage balances were designed and constructed. The balances were mounted one on each end of the model. Each balance measured the model normal force, axial force, and pitching moment. These measurements were accomplished by means of twelve strain gages arranged in three bridges of four each. The physical arrangement of the strain gages is depicted in Figure 4, while the electrical arrangement is presented in Figure 5.

Design of the force balance was complicated by the fact that the balance has to carry the inertia loads as well as the aerodynamic loads. The moment inertia loads become quite large as the oscillation frequency increases. A problem arises in trying to design for the sensitivity required for axial force measurements and still have the capability of transmitting the large moments. For oscillating force measurements, an additional problem of avoiding natural frequencies in the desired operating range arises. With these problems in mind, it was decided to design the balance for an oscillating frequency limit of 15 Hertz in anticipation that if the balance design were satisfactory it could be scaled up for later tests at higher frequencies.

The same carrier equipment and galvanometers used for the pressure instrumentation were used to record the force data. For the force data, only one recorder was required since only six channels were needed for the two balances.

TESTING PROCEDURE AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

All testing was done in the 1.5-foot by 3.875 foot wind tunnel at a dynamic pressure of 28.205 pounds per square foot and an indicated airspeed of 105 mph. Actual test conditions (tunnel temperature and pressure) resulted in velocities ranging between 106 and 108 mph. The Reynolds number based upon the model chord length was 0.93 x 10⁶. Model oscillating frequency was varied from 2 to 15 Hertz (frequency parameter varied

from 0.03 to 0.3) in nine steps for each test condition listed in Table I. Tunnel wall corrections were not applied to the data.

	Pitch-Axis		
	Location, %	ā	Δα
Model	Chord	Deg	Deg
Pressure	25	-0.20	4.00
		-0.20	6.00
		5.80	6.00
		13.83	6.00
		18.00	6.00
Force	25	-0.35	6.08
		5.81	6.08
		13.56	6.08
	37	-0.31	6.08
		5.84	6.08
		13.76	6.08
	50	-0.02	6.08
		6.22	6.08
		14.25	6.08

Pressure Model

Before testing the pressure model, the pressure transducers were calibrated. This calibration was accomplished by connecting the reference pressure manifold to an alchohol manometer and applying various pressures to the system. By recording the manometer reading and taking an oscillographic record for each pressure, the entire system was calibrated using the alcohol manometer as a standard. Since the tunnel dynamic pressure is determined by an alcohol manometer using the same fluid, the pressure coefficients, $\Delta P/q$, are also independent of specific gravity of the alcohol. The reference pressure manifold provided a simple means of calibrating the system and spot-checking the calibration prior to each run.

Having calibrated the transducers, steady state data were obtained for angles of attack varying from -4 degrees to 30 degrees in increments of 2 degrees. Pressure data were recorded for each point. Data for the

individual orifices were read from the oscillograph record and punched into IBM cards using an oscillograph chart reader. The cards were processed by computer to obtain pressure coefficients, normal force, and pitching moment. Normal forces were obtained by integrating the pressure coefficients using a trapezoidal method. Both horizontal and vertical contributions of the pressures were considered in the integration to obtain moments. For purposes of computation, the trailing edge pressure was assumed to be zero.

Before conducting the oscillating test, the transducers were checked for gravitational effects on the diaphragm due to model oscillations. To accomplish this, the pressure orifices were taped at the model surface. The model was oscillated through the speed range, and the oscillograph traces were observed. With the exception of the transducer located at 25 percent chord on the upper surface, there was no indication of any gravitational effects. The transducer mentioned apparently had a loose connection or part, for at frequencies above 8 or 10 Hertz, the signal became erratic. Below this point there was no indication of any gravitational effects.

In order to check for variations in tunnel speed due to model oscillations, a pressure transducer was connected to the piezometer ring just forward of the test section. The signal from this transducer was observed with the tunnel operating, and the model oscillations varied through the test range. There was no indication of unsteadiness arising from the oscillating model.

Being satisfied that there were no extraneous signals due to the design of the system and operating conditions, the oscillating tests listed in Table I were conducted. These tests were chosen so that the effects of oscillating amplitude and mean angle of attack could be determined. The higher mean angles were chosen so that one would be in the vicinity of the steady state stall angle of attack and the other would be well within the stall region. For the high mean angle of attack tests, the pressure transducers were biased by applying a negative pressure to the reference pressure manifold. This shifted the mean values so that the oscillating values would not exceed the deflection limitations of the recording equipment. In this way, the sensitivity of the oscillating signal was not reduced, as it would be if the signal had been attenuated to keep the deflections down.

In order to relate the pressure signals to the model motion, a signal from a potentiometer attached to the pitch shaft was added to both recorders. A timing mark was applied to the position signals to tie the two records together.

Records from the oscillating tests were read and punched into cards in the same manner as the steady state data. Twenty-four points on each of three consecutive cycles were read for the mean angles of attack for which the instantaneous angle of attack did not exceed the steady state stall value. Instantaneous normal forces and pitching moments were computed for these points. These values were then plotted against airfoil angular position. The magnitudes of the oscillating components of normal force and pitching moment and the phase relationships were measured from these plots. For the two higher mean angles of attack, only one cycle was read and computed. The nominal $\Delta\alpha$ value was set on the oscillating mechanism; however, due to deflections in the system, the actual value of $\Delta\alpha$ was higher than the nominal value, and the difference increased with increased oscillating frequency. The actual value of $\Delta\alpha$, which was determined by measuring the travel of the trailing edge of the model at various oscillating speeds, was considered in the computation of the absolute magnitudes of the normal force and pitching moment.

Force Models

Calibration of the strain gage balances was undertaken after completion of the pressure testing. The balances were calibrated in place by substituting an aluminum plate, similar to the force model spar, for the model. The plate was fitted with attachments for loading normal force, axial force, and pitching moments. The balances were loaded in increments of the primary loads to values slightly higher than the anticipated test loads. In addition to the primary loads, combined loads were applied to determine balance interactions. No second-order interactions of any consequence were detected from the results of the combined loads tests. Interaction equations were written for each balance to account for the primary interactions. Sensitivity of the normal force and pitching moment was very good, but axial force was less sensitive than was desirable.

The force model with the pitch axis at 25 percent chord was installed to check out the system, oscillating mechanism, balances, and instrumentation. At low oscillating frequencies, the oscillograph traces were quite smooth. As the frequency of oscillation was increased, a higher frequency disturbance appeared on the traces. The magnitude of this disturbance increased as oscillating frequency increased and reached alarming proportions at the highest frequencies. This disturbance was found to be arising from the excitation of the natural frequency of the model-balance system. The natural frequency in the pitch mode was approximately 130 Hertz while that of the axial force mode was about 30 Hertz. Considerable effort was expended in trying to reduce the magnitude of this disturbance by damping and by increasing the natural frequency so that it would not be excited as readily. Some damping was achieved by using heavier supports and a bearing on the pitch shaft as close to the balance as possible. The only way the natural frequency could be increased was to decrease the model mass or increase the stiffness of the balances. The weight of the

model (2.63 pounds) could not be decreased appreciably. Since the sensitivity of the axial force bulance was already less than that desired, the balance could not be stiffened. Therefore, it was decided to proceed with the tests and depend upon harmonic analysis of the data to provide meaningful results. Fortunately when the model was oscillated with the wind tunnel running, there was an appreciable damping of the natural frequency signal.

Since the force balances measure the inertia loads as well as the aerodynamic forces, it was necessary to determine these loads and subtract them from the total values to obtain the desired aerodynamic characteristics. An attempt was made to oscillate the model in a vacuum to measure the moments of inertia independent of the virtual mass effect of the air. The model was oscillated in a tank at atmospheric pressure and then with the tank evacuated to a pressure of 27 inches of mercury below atmospheric. Leakage around the shaft prevented the attainment of a higher vacuum. There was no measurable difference between the results of these two tests. Therefore, the virtual mass effect of the air was assumed to be negligible, and the inertia loads were determined by oscillating the model in still air.

The procedure of testing the three force models was the same for each one. First the models were mounted in the tunnel on the oscillating mechanism. Known loads were applied to the model to check the balance calibrations. Then steady state wind-on runs were made varying the angle of attack from -4 degrees to 30 degrees, data being recorded for 2-degree increments through the stall angle and 4-degree increments above stall. After obtaining the steady state data, the desired mean angle was set on the oscillator and the model was oscillated through the frequency range with the wind off to obtain the inertia loads. Data were recorded at nine different oscillating frequencies. Immediately after recording the inertia loads, the tunnel was brought up to speed, the model was oscillated at the same frequencies employed for the inertia loads, and data were recorded.

Oscillograph records were read and punched into cards in the same manner as the pressure data. In this case, only seven channels were required, three for each balance and one for a position trace. The data were then processed by computer. Forces and moments were computed for the balances using the interaction equations. These results for the two balances were then averaged to obtain the model normal force, axial force, and pitching moment (in all cases pitching moment is about the pitch axis) acting on the model. A 24-point harmonic analysis was then performed on both inertia data and wind-on data. The results of the inertia analysis were subracted from the wind-on results to obtain the final aerodynamic coefficients and phase relationships.

As was mentioned in the discussion on the pressure model, actual $\Delta \alpha$

values were determined by measurements. The deflection of the model was also measured with a pitching moment applied. The correction to the $\Delta\alpha$ value obtained from the two methods exhibited excellent agreement. All of the nominal $\Delta\alpha$ values were corrected for deflections which were a function of the oscillating frequency.

RESULTS AND COMPARISON OF DATA

Results of the oscillating tests conducted at low mean angles of attack (approximately 0 and 6 degrees) are presented in coefficient form defined as follows:

$$\left| \frac{dC_N}{d\alpha} \right| = \frac{|N|}{1/2 \rho V^2 S \Delta \alpha}$$

and

$$\left| \frac{dC_{M}}{d\alpha} \right| = \frac{|M|}{1/2 \rho V^{2} Sc \Delta \alpha}$$

where $\Delta \alpha$ is measured in radians.

For mean angles where instantaneous angles of attack exceed the steady state stall angle of attack, representative data are presented as instantaneous coefficients versus instantaneous angle of attack.

STEADY STATE RESULTS

Steady state C_N and C_M variations with a are presented in Figure 6. The slopes of the CN versus a curves for all four models show excellent agreement. However, there is considerable variation of the curves in the region near stall. This variation points up some of the problems associated with airfoil stall. All of these models were cast from the same mold and tested in the same facility. Strictly speaking, the steady state CN versus a curves should be the same. It is assumed that slight irregularities at the leading edge of the surface cause the stall to be precipitated differently on each of the four models. In addition to the problem of initial stall is the problem of the unsteady and irregular nature of the flow over the model after it has stalled. Oscillograph records taken in the stall region show rapid fluctuations of the order of 30-50 percent of the maximum recorded normal force. Data presented in Figure 6 for the stall region are average values of these fluctuations. The discrepancies noted in this relatively simple case of steady state stall are emphasized to illustrate the problem of determining maximum CN, stall angle of attack, and aerodynamic characteristics after the inception of stall.

PRESSURE MODEL RESULTS

Normal Force and Pitching Moment Coefficients

The magnitude and phase of the oscillatory normal force and pitching moment coefficients for low mean angles of attack are presented in Figures 7 and 8 as functions of reduced frequency. For purposes of comparison, the theoretical normal forces and pitching moments calculated from Theodorsen's equations 3 are shown along with the measured data. Measured data are presented for two values of mean angle of attack and two values of oscillating amplitude. All of the data shows excellent agreement with theory except for the moment phase angles. The oscillating amplitude of the pitching moment is quite small with the pitch-axis located at 25 percent chord, especially at low oscillating frequencies. This presents a problem in trying to measure phase angles with any degree of accuracy and probably accounts in large measure for the scatter in pitching moment phase data and the discrepancy with theory. Oscillatory amplitudes of normal force and pitching moment coefficients and phase relationships appear to be independent of mean angle of attack and amplitude of oscillation as long as the instantaneous value of angle of attack does not exceed the steady state stall value.

Instantaneous normal force and pitching moment coefficients are presented in Figures 9 and 10 as functions of instantaneous angle of attack for two values of mean angle of attack at representative test values of reduced frequency. Figure 9 presents data for mean angle of attack \bar{lpha} of 13.80 degrees, which is close to the value of α for maximum formal force. Figure 10 is for a value of \bar{a} of 18 degrees, which is well above the steady state stall angle of attack. Steady state normal force and pitching moment are included in Figures 9 and 10 for comparison with the oscillatory values. In Figure 9 it is observed that at the lowest values of reduced frequency, the model stalls at an angle of attack slightly greater than the steady state stall angle. The pitching moment increases in magnitude to a large negative value that is considerably greater than the steady state stall value. With increasing values of k and reduced frequency, the angle of stall for the normal force is delayed until at the highest value of k, there is essentially no indication of stall. A maximum value of $C_{\mathbf{N}}$ of approximately 1.8 is obtained at the highest value of k. This is an increase of about 40 percent over the steady state value of maximum C_N . The increase in negative $C_{\mathbf{M}}$ at stall decreases as k increases and approaches the unstalled condition at the highest frequency. Figure 10 indicates much the same trends as Figure 9. As k increases, the angle for $C_{
m N}$ stall increases. At the highest value of k, the maximum value of C_N^{r} is not reached until after the maximum value of α has been obtained. The maximum value of C_N (2.29) for the highest oscillating frequency exceeds the steady state value by approximately 80 percent. The pitching moment

stalls somewhat sooner than the normal force in all cases. As k increases, the pitching moment at stall increases in magnitude until a value of -0.33 is reached at k = 0.191. With further increase in k, this large negative moment appears to decrease in a manner similar to the case with $\bar{\alpha} = 13.80$ degrees.

Instantaneous Pressure Distributions

Instantaneous pressure distributions are presented in Figures 11 through 16 for some representative conditions. Figures 11 and 12 present pressure distributions for $\bar{\alpha} = 5.80$ degrees at the extremes of the frequency range. Data are presented for an instantaneous angle of attack to compare the instantaneous pressure distributions for that portion of the cycle where α is increasing with the pressure distribution for the same angle when α is decreasing. Figure 11 is representative of the low-frequency end of the data summarized in Figures 7 and 8. From Figure 11, it is seen that there is very little difference between increasing α and decreasing α . This is in agreement with Figures 7 and 8, which indicate a very small normal force phase angle at low frequency and very small pitching moments. For the high-frequency data of Figure 12, there is a noticeable difference in the normal force (area under curve) and pitching moment (area distribution) between increasing and decreasing a. The normal force is greater for a increasing than for a decreasing. This is indicative of the leading phase angle shown in Figure 7. The pitching moment, essentially zero for α increasing, becomes positive with decreasing α , which is indicative of the pitching moment phase lag shown in Figure 8. The pressure distributions also indicate a decrease in C_N magnitude between the lowest and highest reduced frequencies (Figure 7 and 8 respectively), but this is not so obvious without overlaying one figure with the other.

Figures 13 through 15 present instantaneous pressure distributions for selected values of α for low, medium, and high test frequencies respectively. The mean angle $\bar{\alpha}$ for these figures was 13.80 degrees. Data are presented for instantaneous values of α near the mean and near the maximum values. Figure 13 indicates that the model stalls before the maximum angle of attack is reached at the low oscillating frequency. For the midfrequency value presented in Figure 14, the model stalls at or very near the maximum angle of attack, as indicated by the stalled condition for decreasing α . Figure 15 indicates that the model is essentially unstalled. These figures aid in interpreting the results in Figure 9.

Figure 16 presents some very unusual pressure distributions obtained from the highest oscillating frequency test for a mean angle of attack of 18.00 degrees. Data are presented for several instantaneous angles of attack over the positive half cycle of $\Delta \alpha$. These pressure distributions are

directly related to the instantaneous force and moment data presented in Figure 10 for the highest frequency. It is interesting to note in Figure 16 that C_N increases up to and beyond maximum angle of attack even though the peak suction pressures near the leading edge drop off. The relatively large negative pressure coefficients existing over the airfoil upper surface aft of the 25 percent chord are responsible for the large negative moments shown in Figure 10. Also of interest is the flat pressure distribution over the first 20 percent of the lower surface of the airfoil.

Figure 17 presents instantaneous pressure distributions for the lower surface leading edge of the airfoil for various instantaneous angles of attack, with increasing and decreasing α for oscillations about a mean angle of 5.80 degrees. The irregular nature of the distributions presented here was not noted for any of the other test conditions. These irregularities may be indicative of a vortex formation or some other flow peculiarity. In the future, it may be desirable to do some sort of flow visualization on the airfoil oscillating at this condition.

Representative pressure distributions were chosen for presentation in this report. However, since there is little instantaneous experimental pressure distribution data available, it was felt that tabulated coefficients should be presented for one cycle of each test condition. These coefficients are listed in Appendix III.

FORCE TEST RESULTS

Normal Force and Pitching Moment Coefficients

Magnitude and phase of the oscillatory normal force and pitching moment coefficients for the model oscillating about the 25 percent chord axis at low mean angles of attack are presented in Figure 18 and 19. As was the case with the pressure model, the experimental data agree well with theory except for the moment phase angles. The moment phase data show reasonable agreement at the highest values of k, but diverge from theory at the lower k values, tending toward zero phase angle at k equal zero. Admittedly, the accuracy of the pitching moment data in this region leaves much to be desired, but there appears to be a definite trend in both sets of data. An error of just two counts of pitching moment (.002) can produce an error of greater than 10 degrees phase angle in the low k region due to the small magnitudes of the moment. But it would be expected that errors would produce scatter and not such a noticeable trend.

Oscillatory coefficients for the model oscillating about the 37 percent chord are presented in Figures 20 and 21. There is excellent agreement between measured values and theory except for the moment phase angles at the higher k values. Here there is a tendency to diverge from theory,

with measured phase angles being less than the theoretical values.

Data presented in Figures 22 and 23 for oscillations about the 50 percent chord also exhibit excellent agreement with theory. The measured moment values agree very well with theory, but there still appears to be a tendency to diverge at the higher reduced frequencies, as was evidenced in the case of the 37 percent pitch axis.

Drag Coefficients

As was mentioned previously, the drag balance was not as sensitive as was desired. An error in reading the oscillograph record of . 01 in. was equivalent to .0030 (30 counts) in drag coefficient. For the 0012 airfoil tested, this is approximately 50 percent of the minimum drag. This low sensitivity made it difficult to obtain reasonable steady state data at low angles of attack where the drag is quite low. In addition to the sensitivity problem, a temperature problem existed on the drag balances. This apparently comes from the wide spacing of the strain gages in the drag bridge (see Figure 4). The carrier voltage heats the gages. The gages are then cooled by air circulating around them when the tunnel is operating. Some air can circulate since there is a small gap between the model and the tunnel wall. This circulation of air causes unequal cooling at the drag strain gages. This cooling is negligible on the pitching moment and normal force bridges. This temperature shift varied on the three models tested, being greatest on the 25 percent chord pitch axis model and negligible on the 50 percent chord pitch axis model. A test technique eliminated most of this temperature drift. The tunnel was brought up to speed and allowed to run until the drag values stabilized. Then the tunnel was shut down, wind-off zeros were taken, and the tunnel was immediately started again. The small remaining error (arising from the finite time required to stop all flow in the tunnel) was sufficient to cause problems due to the low sensitivity of the balance. This problem was especially aggravating in trying to obtain steady state and mean values of drag. It did not affect the oscillating values, since there was negligible drift during the time required to record the oscillating data. However, obtaining the oscillating data is complicated by the excitation of the natural frequencies of the balances.

In spite of the difficulties, some drag results were obtained and are presented in Figures 24 and 25. Drag coefficients were obtained from the axial force data by means of the following relationship:

$$C_D = C_A \cos \alpha + C_N \sin \alpha$$

Unlike the normal force prior to stall, drag variation is not linear with angle of attack. Therefore, axial force is not linear with angle of attack. The axial force data obtained from the harmonic analysis indicate that the

first three harmonics are significant. Higher harmonics are negligible, except those arising from the natural frequencies which are unwanted. The first and second harmonics contain most of the data of interest. The third harmonic was small in comparison to the first two and was essentially constant. Since it was constant with k and relatively small, neglecting it does not alter the drag picture. Data presented in Figure 24 are for a mean angle of attack of zero degrees. Figure 25 presents the data for a mean angle of approximately 6 degrees. Oscillating amplitude is a nominal 6 degrees in each case. Oscillating drag is entirely different for the two mean angle conditions. In the case of zero mean angle, drag increases with both positive and negative angles of attack. Since the drag variation with angle of attack is fairly flat in this low α region, the drag results would be expected to be essentially a double-frequency sinusoid. For a nominal mean angle of 6 degrees, the drag decreases to a minimum value for - $\Delta \alpha$ and increases to a maximum for + $\Delta \alpha$. The drag curve over this range is nonlinear, with C_D increasing more rapidly with α at the higher angles of attack. Therefore, it would be expected that drag would be a nonsinusoidal curve of the oscillating frequency.

Results of the harmonic analysis of the zero mean angle of attack data show very small first harmonic and third harmonic contributions to the drag. The magnitude of the first harmonic data is probably due to the fact that the mean angle of attack was not exactly zero degrees. The second harmonic data are presented along with the mean drag coefficient in Figure 24 as a function of oscillatory frequency parameter. The mean value of drag is seen to increase rapidly with k. The second harmonic is constant up to a value of k = 0.2, then increases sharply. The sharp increase in the second harmonic is probably due to the excitation of the balance natural frequency, since the natural frequency in the drag direction is approximately 30 Hertz, which is the second harmonic of the oscillating frequency of 15 Hertz at k = 0.3.

Harmonic analysis of the nominal 6-degree mean angle of attack data results in large values of the first harmonic, sizeable values of the second harmonic, and small values of the third harmonic. The second and third harmonics probably arise from the nonlinearity of the drag curve. Figure 25 presents the mean drag coefficient and the first two harmonics as functions of the frequency parameter. As was the case for $\bar{\alpha} = 0$, the mean value of drag increases rapidly with increasing k. The amplitudes of the first and second harmonics decrease with increasing k.

Data for both mean angles of attack exhibit the rapid increase of \overline{C}_D with increasing frequency of oscillation. For low values of k, one would expect the oscillating drag variation to follow the steady state variation with angle of attack. Mean drag coefficients at these low oscillation frequencies are lower than anticipated. Some of this discrepancy may result from the

drag balance temperature problem discussed previously, but it is not conceivable that all of the discrepancy could be arising from this source. For the steady state condition, the drag is a minimum at $\alpha = 0$ degrees and the area of the model surface experiencing turbulent flow is a minimum. As α increases, the area of turbulent flow increases. With the model oscillating, viscous effects may keep the turbulent area from returning to the minimum condition, thereby keeping the drag from obtaining the minimum value. As k increases, the low drag diverges from the steady state minimum. This would account for an increase in the mean value of drag. It would also account for the more rapid rise in \overline{C}_D for $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6 degrees, since the steady state drag increase from $\alpha = 6$ degrees to $\alpha = 12$ degrees is roughly four times as great as the drag rise from 0 to 6 degrees. If this is really the case, then the oscillating component of drag should decrease with increasing k. This is borne out by the decrease in the first harmonic amplitude for the model oscillating about $\alpha = 6$ degrees. However, there is no evidence of a decrease in the amplitude of the second harmonic for the $\alpha = 0$ condition. This may be because the change in amplitude for this condition would be so small that it is masked by the scatter in the data.

In the data presented for $\bar{\alpha}$ = 0 degrees, there is no indication of any changes in the drag coefficients due to change in pitch-axis location. For $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6 degrees, there are considerable changes with pitch axis, especially in the first harmonic values. The mean value of drag tends to increase as the pitch axis is moved rearward and the oscillatory amplitude (first harmonic) decreases. The large change in the first harmonic may be due to an increased camber effect as the pitch axis is moved aft. The leading edge of the model has increased travel as the pitch axis is moved rearward, causing an increase in induced camber. The effect of the camber is to shift the drag curve so that the minimum drag occurs at a higher angle of attack. As the drag curve is shifted, the oscillation takes place over a flatter region of the curve, thereby reducing the difference between minimum and maximum values.

The second harmonic data presented in Figure 25 for $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6 degrees show a decrease in amplitude with increasing k (varying somewhat with pitch-axis location). If the first harmonic (amplitude) is decreasing with k, then a decrease in the second harmonic may result from an accompanying increase in linearity. It should be noted that speaking of amplitudes of the harmonics is not the same as amplitude of oscillating drag, since the drag is composed of the sum of the harmonics.

In spite of the problems associated with obtaining the drag data and the scatter of the results, it is felt that the drag trends are quite pronounced; the consistency obtained from the three models verifies these trends. It is felt that the large mean drag increases reported here would warrant

further investigation. A drag balance of the type used may be feasible if the sensitivity can be increased. It may be possible to use semiconductor strain gages on the balance which give an order of magnitude increase in sensitivity over the foil gages presently employed. If this were possible, then the beams may be thickened, pushing the natural frequency up, and the sensitivity may still be increased by a factor of two or three.

Instantaneous Normal Force and Moment Coefficients

Instantaneous normal force and moment coefficients are presented in Figures 26 and 27 as functions of instantaneous angle of attack for the 50 percent chord model oscillating about a mean angle of attack of 6.22 degrees. Figures 26 and 27 are for low oscillating frequency and high oscillating frequency respectively. These figures, along with Figures 18 through 23, summarize the normal force and moment characteristics for the model oscillating in the linear portion of the angle of attack range. The 50 percent chord axis was chosen for these figures because the greater slope of the pitching moment versus angle of attack curve aids in the pictorial presentation. Data for the other models could have been presented and the conclusions would not be altered. The experimental data in Figures 26 and 27 are the fundamental harmonics obtained from the results of the harmonic analysis. Results of the harmonic analysis indicate that there was very little deviation from pure sinusoidal motion. The average amount of second harmonic present in pitching moment, normal force, and motion was equal to or less than 1 percent of the fundamental amplitude. This justifies the use of the fundamental harmonic for data presentation and accounts for the smooth curves presented. Theoretical values are presented in the figures for comparison with experimental results.

Agreement between theory and experimental results is excellent as far as shape, magnitude, and direction of traverse are concerned; but at the higher frequency, there is a noticeable displacement between the curves. The direction of traverse and the oblateness of the curve are functions of the phase relationship. The direction of traverse changes or the normal force for the low-and high-frequency curves. This agrees with the data of Figure 22 which show the phase angle to be about equal for the two frequencies but of different sign. The decrease in amplitude for the two frequencies as indicated in Figure 22 shows up as a tilting of the curve in Figure 27. The agreement between theory and experiment regarding size, shape, and direction of traverse relates to the oscillatory components. However, the displacement of the curves indicates a discrepancy between the mean values predicted by theory and the results of the tests. The mean values of normal force and moment predicted by theory³ are:

$$\bar{C}_N = 2 \pi \bar{\alpha} C(k)^*$$

$$\bar{C}_M = (1/2 + a) \pi \bar{\alpha} C(k)$$

where a is a constant for a given model

C(k) is Theodorsen's complex circulation function, F(k) + i G(k)

For k = 0, F(k) is equal to 1, G(k) equals zero, and steady state theory results. At k > 0, C(k) is always less than 1, resulting in a decrease of mean values with increasing oscillating frequency. Test results give no evidence of this decrease of mean values. Some of the test results for normal force mean values are presented along with theory in Figure 28.

Instantaneous normal force and pitching monient coefficients are presented in Figures 29 through 31 for the 25, 37, and 50 percent pitch-axis models, respectively, as functions of instantaneous angle of attack. The mean angle for each case is in the proximity of the steady state stall angle of attack. The normal force curves are quite similar for the three models and show the same trends as the pressure model data. That is, normal force stall is delayed as the oscillating frequency is increased until at high frequency, there is essentially no indication of stall. While the curves and the trends are quite similar, there are some differences in the individual shapes. These differences probably arise from the differences in the steady state stall characteristics of the models and the differences between steady state stall angle of attack and oscillating mean angle. In other words, if the same model were oscillated at slightly different mean angles close to the steady state stall angle, the resulting instantaneous curves would have slightly different shapes. However, the general trend with k should remain the same. From the oscillograph records, it was observed that there was even a slight variation in instantaneous forces and moments from cycle to cycle. The data presented in the figures of this report are for a representative cycle.

Instantaneous pitching moments exhibit considerable variation with pitch-axis location. This would be expected due to the large differences in the steady state pitching moment for the different pitch axis. However, there are also differences in the trends with changes in frequency parameter. For the pitch axis at the 25 percent chord location, the pitching moment experiences a sharp negative increase in magnitude to a value of -0.36 at k = .103. As k increases, this magnitude is reduced. The pressure model

 $^{^*}$ C_N and C_L are used interchangeably, since they are very nearly equal at low angles of attack.

exhibited a similar increase in negative magnitude to -0.33, which is almost an identical magnitude, under slightly different test conditions. The exact frequency at which this increase in magnitude occurs is probably dependent upon the nature of the steady state stall and the mean angle at which the model is oscillating. An increase of reduced magnitude occurs for the 37 percent pitch-axis model at the same k value. It is again, negative peak in CM diminishes as k increases. There is no indication of this sharp change when the pitch axis is located at the 50 percent chord point. Here the minimum pitching moment is about the same for all values of k. Thus, the sharp change in pitching moment appears to be a function of reduced frequency and pitch-axis location.

COMPARISON OF DATA

Comparison With Theory

Theoretical results based on the thin airfoil incompressible theory of Theodorsen³ have been presented along with the experimental results where applicable. The agreement between theory and experiment is excellent for normal force coefficients (both phase and amplitude). Pitching moment amplitude agrees well with theory, but there are some discrepancies in phase angles. The phase angle for the 25 percent pitch-axis force model tends to approach zero degrees as k goes to zero rather than the value of 270 degrees predicted theoretically. This trend has also been noted by Wyss and Herrera for different airfoil profiles oscillating about the quarter chord. There is no evidence of this trend in the pressure data results, but then it was not possible to determine the phase angles at k values below 0.1 with any degree of accuracy from the test results. Theoretically, the moment amplitude goes to zero as k approaches zero (steady state theory). However, the experimental results indicate finite values of CN for α other than zero. Therefore, one would expect an oscillatory amplitude greater than zero at very low k values, and since the moment is finite, as the α range is traversed very slowly, the phase angle should be essentially zero degrees. Phase angle data for the 37 percent pitch-axis model diverge from the theoretical values at higher k values. No reasonable explanation for this divergence is now available, since the data for both the 25 percent axis model and the 50 percent axis model show good agreement with theory at the higher values of k.

Comparison of Pressure Model and Force Model Results

Oscillatory normal force and pitching moment data obtained by pressure measurements and those obtained by direct force measurements may be compared by examining Figures 7, 8, 18, and 19. The data presented in these figures are for the pitch axis located at the quarter chord and for

oscillations about small mean angles of attack. Theoretical results are presented in all figures so that the data may be compared by noting the agreement with theory. The results of the two models show excellent agreement except in the case of pitching moment phase angle, as noted previously.

Instantaneous normal force and pitching moments are presented for the two models in Figures 9, 10, and 29. The instantaneous curves for the two models have similar shape and indicate the same trends with increasing oscillating frequency. The differences in shape of the individual curves obtained for a given oscillating frequency are to a large measure attributed to the differences in the stall characteristics of the two models and the relationship of the mean angle of attack to the steady state stall angle of attack. The minimum pitching moment values for the pressure model and the force model of -0.33 and -0.36, respectively, compare exceedingly well. Also, from Figures 9 and 29, for which the mean angle is close to the stall angle, the maximum C_N values obtained for both models of approximately 1.8 agree quite well.

Comparison With Previous Results

Some previous investigations are reported in Appendix I for airfoils oscillating at low mean angles of attack. Once again the data are compared with theory and can be compared with the results of this investigation using theoretical values as a guide.

Instantaneous normal force and pitching moment coefficients for airfoils oscillating in the stall region are presented by Halfman⁵, Carta⁶, and Liiva, Davenport, Gray and Walton⁷. Halfman presents data for three 12-percent-thickness airfoils which he refers to as sharp, blunt, and intermediate. The intermediate airfoil is very similar to the NACA 0012 airfoil. Carta tested a 0012 airfoil. Liiva et al tested a Vertol 23010-1.58 airfoil and a 0012 airfoil.

Data presented by Halfman are for a pitch axis at 37 percent chord. Only instantaneous pitching moments are presented, and only a portion of this is for the intermediate airfoil. The data presented for comparable conditions show essentially the same type loops and indicate the large drop in pitching moment as reported herein. The two investigations were conducted at the same value of Reynolds number. Liiva et al present both instantaneous normal force and pitching moment coefficients for an NACA 0012 airfoil oscillating about the quarter chord at a Mach number of 0.4. With the exception of Mach number, oscillating conditions are nearly the same as those reported herein for the 25 percent pitch-axis models. The higher Mach number changes the steady state data somewhat, but the shape of the CN versus angle-of-attack curve at the stall point is very similar to that of

the force model of this report. The curves show good agreement in shape, magnitude, and trends. Data of this report are for a mean angle closer to the stall angle than that reported by Liiva. Therefore, the model approaches the unstalled condition at a lower value of frequency parameter, causing the curves of this report to agree with those at a somewhat higher value of k in Liiva's report. The values of C_N maximum agree very well (1.7 as compared to 1.8 of this report). The pitching moment drop shows excellent agreement in magnitude (-0.33 as compared to -0.36 of this report).

Halfman⁸ presents some drag data for an NACA 0012 airfoil oscillating in pitch about the 37 percent chord at a mean angle of zero degrees. He presents an average drag-amplitude coefficient as a function of k. This drag-amplitude coefficient increases with increasing k. This trend is contradictory to the results of this investigation, which indicate that the mean value increases with increasing k but the oscillatory magnitude remains essentially constant ($\bar{\alpha}$ = 0 degrees) or decreases with increasing k ($\bar{\alpha}$ = 6 degrees). There are no other oscillatory drag data available to support either of these investigations.

CONCLUSIONS

The literature survey revealed considerable low-speed experimental data on oscillating two-dimensional airfoils. Very little of this data can be directly correlated due to the number of parameters involved (oscillating frequency, oscillating amplitude, mean angle of attack, test Reynolds number, airfoil profile and pitch-axis location) and the choice of data recorded by the investigators. In cases where direct correlation is possible, scatter of the data restricts the possibility of any definite conclusions.

The agreement between experimental data of this investigation, obtained from the pressure measurements and the direct force measurements, and the theoretical data at low mean angles of attack indicates that both methods can produce satisfactory results over the frequency range tested. However, it is felt that the present force balance was operating very near its useful limit at the higher oscillating frequencies. Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of each are as follows:

Pressure measurements:

- 1. Results are not affected by inertia loads.
- 2. Model supports can be rigid enough that natural frequencies present no problems.
- 3. Instantaneous pressure distributions may be obtained.

Force measurements:

- 1. Requires less instrumentation.
- 2. Less data processing.
- 3. Possible to obtain drag information. (Oscillating drag trends were obtained in this investigation, but actual drag magnitudes are questionable due to lack of sensitivity and low natural frequency of the drag balance.)

The disadvantages are:

Pressure measurements:

- 1. Drag data are not available.
- 2. Requires considerable instrumentation for a reasonable

number of pressure orifices.

- 3. Requires considerable data processing.
- 4. Difficult to install sufficient number of pressure transducers in model.

Force model:

- 1. Inertia loads must be transmitted through the force balance.
 This imposes problems for balance design.
- 2. Flexibility required for balance sensitivity results in low natural frequencies.
- 3. Inertia loads must be eliminated from measurements in some way.

The fact that the pressure data, which were measured along the centerline of the model where the gaps between the model and the tunnel walls had minimal effect upon the results, agree well with the force data indicates that the small gaps employed during the test had little influence upon the data.

From this investigation, it may be concluded that:

- 1. For values of instantaneous angle of attack not exceeding the steady state stall value, theoretical predictions show good agreement with test results.
- 2. When oscillating at high frequency about mean angles above the steady state stall angle, values of C_N much greater than the steady state maximum value may be obtained. A value of 2.29 was obtained during this investigation. This is approximately 80 percent greater than the steady state value. It may be possible to achieve considerably higher values with appropriate values of $\bar{\alpha}$, and k.
- 3. For the models with the pitch axis at the quarter chord, sharp decreases in pitching moment were experienced at some frequencies when the instantaneous angle of attack exceeded the steady state stall values. The minimum value noted during this investigation was -0.36. The decreases in pitching moment were less severe as the pitch axis was moved toward the midchord.
- 4. Mean drag values increase rapidly with increasing oscillating frequency.

5. Drag results of this investigation indicate a need for better drag studies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the possibility of increasing the sensitivity of the drag balances, by use of semiconductor strain gages, and increasing the natural frequency of the balance be investigated to obtain more accurate oscillating drag data.

The unusual pressure distributions noted on the lower surface leading edge of the model under some oscillating conditions indicate a possible vortex formation. It would be desirable to do some flow visualization studies to determine the nature of the flow in this region.





FIGURE 1. Oscillating Drive Mechanism Mounted Under the Test Section of the 1.5-Foot by 3.875-Foot Wind Tunnel.



View With Tunnel Wall Removed of Force Model (Axis at 50% Chord) Installed in Test Section. FIGURE 2.





FIGURE 3. Details of Pressure Transducer Installation.






FIGURE 4. Strain Gage Force Balance, Gage Locations.




FIGURE 5. Strain Gage Electrical Connections.




FIGURE 6. Static $C_{\mbox{\scriptsize N}}$ and $C_{\mbox{\scriptsize M}}$ Characteristics.




FIGURE 7. Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Pressure Model Cscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord.




FIGURE 8. Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Pressure Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord.




FIGURE 9. Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M, & • 13.80°.




FIGURE 9. Continued.




FIGURE 9. Continued.




FIGURE 9. Continued.




FIGURE 10. Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M , $\bar{\alpha}$ = 18°




FIGURE 10. Continued.




FIGURE 10. Continued.




FIGURE 10. Continued.




FIGURE 11. Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\alpha = 10.05^{\circ}$, $\bar{\alpha} = 5.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.0^{\circ}$, k = .032.




FIGURE 12. Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\alpha = 10.16$ °, $\bar{\alpha} = 5.80$ °, $\Delta \alpha = 6.17$ °, k = .268.




FIGURE 13. Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 13.80°, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.02°, k = .032.




FIGURE 13. Continued.

FIGURE 14. Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\alpha = 13.80^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.07^{\circ}$, k = .123.




FIGURE 14. Continued

FIGURE 15. Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 13.80°, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.17°, k = .266.

0.4

x/c

0.2

1.0

0.8

0.6




FIGURE 15. Continued




FIGURE 16. Instantaneous Pressure Distributions, $\ddot{\sigma} = 18.00^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 617^{\circ}$, k = .266.




FIGURE 16. Continued




FIGURE 16. Continued




FIGURE 16. Continued

INCREASING α ---- DECREASING α




FIGURE 17. Instantaneous Lower Surface Leading Edge Pressure Distributions, $\bar{\alpha} = 5.80^{\circ}$.




FIGURE 18. Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$.




FIGURE 19. Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 25% Chord, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.08°.




FIGURE 20. Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 37% Chord, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.08°.




FIGURE 21. Variation of Pitching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch Pitch Axis at 37% Chord, $\Delta s = 6.08^{\circ}$.





FIGURE 22. Variation of Normal Force Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 50% Chord, &c. 6.08.



Variation of Litching Moment Coefficient With Reduced Frequency for Force Model Oscillating in Pitch, Pitch Axis at 50% Chord, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$.




FIGURE 24. Variation of Drag Coefficient With Reduced Frequency, $\bar{\alpha} \approx 0^{\circ}$.




FIGURE 25. Variation of Drag Coefficient With Reduced Frequency, $\tilde{\alpha} \approx 6$ °.




FIGURE 25. Continued




FIGURE 26. Dynamic C_N and C_M for 50% Pitch Axis Model Oscillating at Low Frequency About $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6.22°, k = .032, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.30°.




FIGURE 27. Dynamic C_N and C_M for 50% Pitch Axis Model Oscillating at High Frequency About $\bar{\alpha}$ = 6.22°, k = .297, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.38°.




FIGURE 28. Variation of Normal Force Mean Values With Reduced Frequency.




FIGURE 29. Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and C_M , Pitch Axis = 25% Chord, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 13.56°.




FIGURE 29. Continued




FIGURE 29. Continued




FIGURE 29. Continued





FIGURE 30. Continued






FIGURE 30. Continued




FIGURE 30. Continued




FIGURE 31. Effect of Frequency on Dynamic C_N and $C_{\tilde{M}}$. Pitch Axis * 50% Chord, \tilde{a} * 14.25*.




FIGURE 31. Continued




FIGURE 31. Continued




FIGURE 31. Continued

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. Windsor, R. I., OSCILLATING MECHANISM DESIGN REPORT, Research Memorandum 1967-5, Wind Tunnel Operations Department, University of Maryland, 1967.
- 2. Patterson, John L., A MINIATURE ELECTRICAL PRESSURE GAGE UTILIZING A STRETCHED FLAT DIAPHRAGM, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 2659, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., April 1952.
- 3. Theodorsen, Theodore, GENERAL THEORY OF AERODYNAMIC INSTABILITY AND THE MECHANISM OF FLUTTER, Report No. 496, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1940.
- 4. Wyss, John A., and Herrera, Raymond, EFFECTS OF ANGLE OF ATTACK AND AIRFOIL PROFILE ON THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL FLUTTER DERIVATIVES FOR AIRFOILS OSCILLATING IN PITCH AT HIGH SUBSONIC SPEEDS, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Research Memorandum RM A54H12, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., Sept. 1958.
- 5. Halfman, Robert C., Johnson, H. C., and Haley, S. M., EVALUATION OF HIGH-ANGLE-OF-ATTACK AERODYNAMIC DERIVATIVE DATA AND STALL-FLUTTER PREDICTION TECHNIQUES, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Technical Note 2533, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1951.
- 6. Carta, F. O., EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE UNSTEADY AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF AN NACA 0012 AIRFOIL, United Aircraft Research Laboratories, Report M-1283-1, United Aircraft Corporation, East Hartford, Connecticut, July 1960.
- 7. Liiva, Jaan, Davenport, Franklyn J., Gray, Lewis, and Walton, Ivor C., TWO-DIMENSIONAL TESTS OF AIRFOILS OSCILLATING NEAR STALL, Vol. I, The Boeing Company. USAAVLABS Technical Report 68-13A, U. S. Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories, Fort Eustis, Virginia, April 1968.
- 8. Halfman, Robert L., EXPERIMENTAL AERODYNAMIC DERIVATIVES OF A SINUSOIDALLY OSCILLATING AIRFOIL IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL FLOW, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Technical Note 2465, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., November 1951.

- 9. Bratt, J.B., and Scruton, C., MEASUREMENTS OF PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR AN AEROFOLL OSCILLATING ABOUT THE HALF-CHORD AXIS, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 1921, London, England, 1938.
- 10. Silversiein, A. and Joyner, U.T., EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION OF THE THEORY OF OSCILLATING AIRFOLLS, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Report 673, Washington, D. C., 1939.
- 11. Reid, E.G., and Vencenti, W., AN EXPERIMENTAL DETERMINA-TION OF THE LIFT OF AN OSCILLATING AIRFOIL, <u>Journal of</u> <u>Aeronautical Sciences</u>, Vol. 8, No. 1, November 1940.
- 12. Reid, E.G., EXPERIMENTS ON THE LIFT OF AIRFOILS IN NON-UNIFORM MOTION, Stanford University Report, July 23, 1942.
- 13. Bratt, J.B. and Wight, K.C., THE EFFECT OF MEAN INCIDENCE, AMPLITUDE OF OSCILLATION, PROFILE AND ASPECT RATIO ON PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2064, 1945.
- 14. Greidanas, J.H., Van de Vooren, A.L., and Bergh, H., EXPERI-MENTAL DETERMINATION OF THE AERODYNAMIC COEFFICIENTS OF AN OSCILLATING WING IN INCOMPRESSIBLE TWO-DIMEN-SIONAL FLOW, Netherlands National Aero and Astronautical Research Institute Reports F-101-104, 1952.
- 15. Smith, F. E., and Sevik, M., AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FORCES ON AN AIRFOIL OSCILLATING IN PITCH ABOUT THE QUARTER CHORD, N64-21587, Ordnance Research Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1964.
- 16. Bratt, J.B., and Chinneck, A., MEASUREMENTS OF MID-CHORD PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES AT HIGH SPEEDS, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2680, London, England, 1947.
- 17. Wyss, J. A., and Monfort, J. C., EFFECTS OF AIRFOIL PROFILE ON THE TWO DIMENSIONAL FLUTTER DERIVATIVES FOR WINGS OSCILLATING IN PITCH AT HIGH SUBSONIC SPEEDS, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, RM A54C24, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1954.
- 18. Monfort, J. C., and Wyss, J. A., EFFECTS OF RIGID SPOILERS ON THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL FLUTTER DERIVATIVES OF AIRFOILS OSCILLATING IN PITCH AT HIGH SUBSONIC SPEEDS, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, RM A54122, National Advisory Committee for

- Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1954.
- 19. Runyan, H. L., and Wooston, D. S., THEORETICAL AND EXPERI-MENTAL INVESTIGATIONS OF THE EFFECT OF TUNNEL WALLS ON THE FORCES ON AN OSCILLATING AIRFOIL IN TWO-DIMEN-SIONAL SUBSONIC COMPRESSIBLE FLOW, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 3416, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1955, AD 65942.
- 20. Rainey, A. G., MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC FORCES FOR VARIOUS ANGLES OF ATTACK ON AN AIRFOIL OSCILLATING IN PITCH AND ON TWO FINITE-SPAN WINGS OSCILLATING IN BEND-ING WITH EMPHASIS ON DAMPING IN THE STALL, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 3643, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1956, AD 93417.
- 21. Clevenson, S. A., and Widmayer, E., EXPERIMENTAL MEASURE-MENTS OF FORCES AND MOMENTS ON A TWO-DIMENSIONAL WING AT SUBSONIC SPEEDS, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 3686, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1956.
- 22. Pugh, P. G., and Woodgate, L., MEASUREMENTS OF PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR BLUNT-NOSE AEROFOILS OSCIL-LATING IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL SUPERSONIC FLOW, ARC 23 012, Aeronautical Research Council, London, England, 1961, AD278361.
- 23. Orlik-Ruckemann, K., and La Berge, J.G., OSCILLATORY EXPERI-MENTS IN A HELIUM HYPERSONIC WIND TUNNEL. Aeronautical Establishment, Ottawa, Canada, 1962, AD 276053.
- 24. Scruton, C., Woodgate, L., Lapworth, K.C., and Maybrey, J., MEASUREMENTS OF PITCHING-MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR AIR-FOILS OSCILLATING IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL SUPERSONIC FLOW, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 3234, London, England, 1962.
- 25. Ashley, H., Tzartarian, G., and Nielson, D. O., INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN UNSTEADY AERODYNAMIC EFFECTS ON LONGITUDINAL STABILITY, USAF Technical Report No. 5986, 1951.
- 26. Buchan, A. L., Harris, K.D., and Somervail, P.M., THE MEAS-UREMENTS OF THE DERIVATIVE Z_W FOR AN OSCILLATING AIR-FOIL, College of Aeronautics, Cranfield, Current Paper No. 47, Aeronautical Research Council, London, England, 1951.

- 27. Wright, J. G., and Wilkinson, A., LOW SPEED WIND-TUNNEL MEASUREMENTS OF OSCILLATORY DERIVATIVES FOR A FAMILY OF SLENDER WINGS, PART II, DAMPING IN PITCH, Bristol Aircraft Ltd., Report W. T. 348, 1960.
- 28. Scruton, C., Woodgate, L., and Alexander, A. J., MEASUREMENTS OF THE AERODYNAMIC DERIVATIVES FOR SWEPT WINGS OF LOW ASPECT RATIO DESCRIBING PITCHING AND PLUNGING OSCILLATIONS IN INCOMPRESSIBLE FLOW, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2925, London, England, 1957.
- 29. Moss, G. F., LOW-SPEED WIND-TUNNEL MEASUREMENTS OF LONGITUDINAL OSCILLATORY DERIVATIVES ON THREE WING PLAN-FORMS, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 3009, 1957.
- 30. Gagett, P. R. and Curran, J. K., AERODYNAMIC DERIVATIVE MEASUREMENTS ON A RECTANGULAR WING OF ASPECT RATIO 3.3, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 3171, 1958.
- 31. Rainey, A. G., PRELIMINARY STUDY OF SOME FACTORS WHICH AFFECT THE STALL FLUTTER CHARACTERISTICS OF THIN WINGS, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 3622, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1956.
- 32. Clevenson, S. A., and Leadbetter, S. A., SOME MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC FORCES AND MOMENTS AT SUBSONIC SPEEDS ON A WING-TANK CONFIGURATION OSCILLATING IN PITCH ABOUT THE WING MID-CHORD, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 3822, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., 1956.
- 33. Widmayer, E., Jr., Clevenson, S. A., and Leadbetter, S. A., SOME MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC FORCES AND MOMENTS AT SUBSONIC SPEEDS ON A RECTANGULAR WING OF ASPECT RATIO 2, OSCILLATING ABOUT THE MID-CHORD, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Technical Note 4240, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C. 1958.
- 34. Leadbetter, S. A., Clevenson, S. A., and Igoe, W.B., EXPERI-MENTAL INVESTIGATION OF OSCILLATORY AERODYNAMIC FORCES, MOMENTS, AND PRESSURES ACTING ON A TAPERED WING OSCIL-LATING IN PITCH AT MACH NUMBERS FROM 0.40 to 1.07, Langley Research Center, Technical Note D-1236, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D. C., 1962.

- 35. Orlik-Ruckemann, K. J., and La Berge, J. G., STATIC AND DYNAMIC LONGITUDINAL STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF A SERIES OF DELTA AND SWEPTBACK WINGS AT SUPERSONIC SPEEDS, Aeronautical Report LR-396, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 1966, AD 484399.
- 36. Kurglowich, G., INVESTIGATION OF THE OSCILLATORY DERIVATIVES OF AN AIRFOIL WITH FLAPS OSCILLATING AT NEGATIVE ANGLES OF ATTACK, UTIA TN 55, 1961.
- 37. Larcombe, M. J., and Peto, J. W., THE RESPONSE TIMES OF TYPICAL TRANSDUCER-TUBE CONFIGURATIONS FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF PRESSURE IN HIGH SPEED WIND TUNNELS, Aeronautical Research Council (England), Current Paper (C. P.) No. 913, 1966, AD805487, (N67-21204).
- 38. Bergh, H., and Tijdeman, H., THEORETICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS FOR THE DYNAMIC RESPONSE OF PRESSURE MEASURING SYSTEMS, National Aero and Astronautical Research Institute (Holland), NLR-TR F. 238, January 1965 (N66-15953).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acum, W. E. A., THE COMPARISON OF THEORY AND EXPERIMENT FOR OSCILLATING WINGS, NPL Aeronautical Report 1005, March 1962, AD288603.

Acum, W. E. A., and Garner, H. C., THE ESTIMATION OF OSCILLATORY WING AND CONTROL DERIVATIVES, North Atlantic Treaty Organization Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development, April 1961, AD275409.

Acum, W. E. A., THEORY OF LIFTING SURFACES OSCILLATING AT GENERAL FREQUENCIES IN A STREAM OF HIGH SUBSONIC MACH NUMBER, Aeronautical Research Council 17824, 1956.

Acum, W. E. A., WALL CORRECTIONS FOR WINGS OSCILLATING IN WIND TUNNELS OF CLOSED RECTANGULAR SECTION, Aeronautical Research Council R and M No. 3312, January 1958.

Baker, W. E., and Ewing, W. O., Jr., MINIATURE PIEZOELECTRIC GAGES FOR MEASURING TRANSIENT PRESSURES ON AIRFOILS, AD258017.

Beam, Benjamin H., THE EFFECTS OF OSCILLATION AMPLITUDE AND FREQUENCY ON THE EXPERIMENTAL DAMPING IN PITCH OF A TRI-ANGULAR WING HAVING AN ASPECT RATIO OF 4, NACA RMA52G07, 1952.

Beckman, P.A., and Martin, R.J., MEASUREMENTS OF OSCILLATORY AERODYNAMIC INFLUENCE COEFFICIENTS, Stewart-Warner Corporation, February 1957, AD135045.

Beckman, P.A., and Martin, R.J., MEASUREMENT OF OSCILLATORY AERODYNAMIC INFLUENCE COEFFICIENTS. Progress Report No. 3, Wright Air Development Center, March 1957, AD135046.

Bergh, H., A NEW METHOD FOR MEASURING THE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION ON HARMONICALLY OSCILLATING WINGS OF ARBITRARY PLANFORM, ICAS Paper 64-576, December 1964.

Biot and Boehnlein, AERODYNAMIC THEORY OF OSCILLATING WINGS OF FINITE SPAN, Report No. 5, Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratories, California Institute of Technology, October 1963.

Bratt, J.B., Payner, W.G., and Cartwright, R., MEASUREMENTS OF THE DIRECT PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR A DELTA WING AT HIGH SUBSONIC SPEEDS, ARC No. 13, 866.0937, March 1951.

Bratt, J.B., Rayner, W. G., and Wight, K. C., MEASUREMENTS OF THE DIRECT PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR TWO-DIMENSIONAL FLOW AT SUBSONIC AND SUPERSONIC SPEEDS, Aeronautical Research Council 20, 714, 21 January 1959.

Bratt, J.B., Wight, K. C., and Chinneck, A., FREE OSCILLATIONS OF AN AEROFOIL ABOUT THE HALF-CHORD AXIS AT HIGH INCIDENCES AND PITCHING MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR DECAYING OSCILLATIONS, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2214, 1940.

Chu, W. H., UNSTEADY BOUNDARY-LAYER FLOW OVER AN OSCILLATING THIN FOIL, Journal of Hydronautics, Vol. 2, No. 2, April 1968.

Cicala, Placido, PRESENT STATE OF DEVELOPMENT IN NON-STEADY MOTION OF A LIFTING SURFACE, NACA TM 1277, October 1951.

Clevenson, Sherman A., Leadbetter, Sumner A., and Tuovila, Weimer, J., DISCUSSION OF THREE-DIMENSIONAL OSCILLATING AIR FORCES BASED ON WIND-TUNNEL MEASUREMENTS, NACA RML53E18a, 1953.

Clevenson, S. A., and Tomassoni, J.E., EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE OSCILLATING FORCES AND MOMENTS ON A TWO-DIMENSIONAL WING EQUIPPED WITH AN OSCILLATING CIRCULAR-ARC SPOILER, NACA TN 3949, March 1957.

Corner, Fox, Willey, Craig, and Twomey, William, A FLIGHT AND WIND TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF ANGLE-OF-ATTACK RATE ON MAXIMUM LIFT COEFFICIENT, NASA-CR-321, 1965.

Davies, D. E., THE AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON AN OSCILLATING TWO-DIMENSIONAL WING IN ACCELERATED SUPERSONIC FLIGHT, Report No. Structures 262, 1961, Royal Aircraft Establishment, 1961, AD258165.

Davies, D. E., THE AIR FORCES ON THE LOW ASPECT RATIO RECTANGULAR WING OSCILLATING IN SONIC FLOW, Technical Note No. Structures 311, Royal Aircraft Establishment, 1962, AD277095.

DeJager, THE AERODYNAMIC FORCES AND MOMENTS ON AN OSCILLATING AEROFOIL WITH CONTROL SURFACE BETWEEN TWO PARALLEL WALLS, Report F-140, Netherlands National Aero and Astronautical Research Institute, 1953.

Dietz, F., THE AIR FORCES OF THE HARMONICALLY VIBRATING WING IN COMPRESSIBLE MEDIUM AT SUBSONIC VELOCITY (PLANE PROBLEM), AAF, Air Mat. Com., Wright Field, Technical Intelligence, Trans F-TS-506-RE, November 1946.

Dietz, F., THE AIR FORCES OF THE HARMONICALLY VIBRATING WING IN A COMPRESSIBLE MEDIUM AT SUBSONIC VELOCITY (PLANE PROBLEM) PART II: NUMERICAL TABLE AND CURVES, AAF, Air Mat. Com., Wright Field, Technical Intelligence, Trans F-TS-948-RE, March 1947.

Drake, D.G., WIND TUNNEL INTERFERENCE FOR OSCILLATING WINGS AT TRANSONIC SPEEDS, University of Liverpool, ARC21, 489, Aeronautical Research Council, London, England, 1959, AD239782.

Drischer, H., MODERN UNSTEADY AEROFOIL THEORY, Translation Available as British Aeronautical Research Council Paper 11843, 1948.

Drischler, Joseph A., APPROXIMATE INDICIAL LIFT FUNCTIONS FOR SEVERAL WINGS OF FINITE SPAN IN INCOMPRESSIBLE FLOW AS OBTAINED FROM OSCILLATORY LIFT COEFFICIENTS, NACA TN 3639, 1956.

Farren, W.S., REACTION ON A WING WHOSE ANGLE OF INCIDENCE IS CHANGING RAPIDLY, ARC R and M 1648, 1935.

Gadeberg, Burnett L., THE EFFECT OF RATE OF CHANGE OF ANGLE OF ATTACK ON THE MAXIMUM LIFT COEFFICIENT OF A PURSUIT AIRPLANE, NACA TN 2525, 1951.

Garby, L.C., Kuethe, A.M., and Schetzer, J.D., THE GENERATION OF GUSTS IN A WIND TUNNEL AND MEASUREMENT OF UNSTEADY LIFT ON AN AIRFOIL, University of Michigan, Wright Air Development Center Technical Report 57-401, June 1957, AD130984.

Garner, H.C., MULTHOPP'S SUBSONIC LIFTING SURFACE THEORY OF WINGS IN SLOW PITCHING OSCILL ATIONS, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2885, 1952.

Garner, H.C., NOTE ON THE PITCHING DAMPING OF SLENDER WINGS, ARC22, 541, 1961.

Garner, H.C., and Leehrian, D.E., PITCHING DERIVATIVES FOR A GOTHIC WING OSCILLATING ABOUT A MEAN INCIDENCE, NPL Aero Note 1010, National Physics Laboratory, 1963, AD423104.

- Garner, H.C., and Lehrian, D.E., COMPARATIVE THEORETICAL CALCULATIONS OF FORCES ON OSCILLATING WINGS THROUGH THE TRANSONIC SPEED RANGE, NPL Aero Report 1246, National Physics Laboratory, 1967.
- Giesing, J.P., NONLINEAR TWO-DIMENSIONAL UNSTEADY PO-TENTIAL FLOW WITH LIFT. <u>Journal of Aircraft</u>, Vol. 5, No. 2, March-April 1968.
- Glauert, H., THE FORCE AND MOMENT ON AN OSCILLATING AERO-FOIL, R and M 1242, 1929.
- Greenberg, J. Mayo, SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON AN AIRFOIL IN AN OSCILLATING STREAM, NACA TN 1372, August 1947.
- Harper, Paul W., and Flanigan, Roy E., INVESTIGATION OF THE VARIATION OF MAXIMUM LIFT FOR A PITCHING AIRPLANE MODEL AND COMPARISON WITH FLIGHT RESULTS NACA TN 1734, 1948.
- Harper, Paul W., and Flanigan, Roy E., THE EFFECT OF RATE OF CHANGE OF ANGLE OF ATTACK ON THE MAXIMUM LIFT OF A SMALL MODEL, NACA TN 2061, 1950.
- Harris, G.Z., MERCURY PROGRAMMES FOR LIFTING SURFACE THEORY CALCULATIONS ON WINGS OSCILLATING IN SUPERSONIC FLOW, ARC C.P. No. 851, 1966, AD803298.
- Harris, G.Z., THE CALCULATION OF GENERALIZED FORCES ON OSCILLATING WINGS IN SUPERSONIC FLOW BY LIFTING SURFACE THEORY, ARC R and M 3453, 1966, AD807675.
- HSU, P.T., FLUTTER OF LOW-ASPECT RATIO WINGS PART 1: CALCULATION OF PRESSURE DISTRICUTIONS FOR OSCILLATING WINGS OF ARBITRARY PLANFORM IN SUBSONIC FLOW BY THE KERNEL FUNCTION METHOD, M.I.T., Aeroelastic and Structures Research Lab., Report 64-1, October 1957.
- Hsu, P.T., PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION AND FLUTTER ANALYSIS OF LOW-ASPECT RATIO WINGS, M.I.T., Aeroelastic and Structures Research Lab., Report 64-3, June 1959.
- Jones, Robert T., THE UNSTEADY LIFT OF A WING OF FINITE ASPECT RATIO, NACA Report No. 681, 1940.
- Jones, W.P., WIND TUNNEL INTERFERENCE FFFECT ON THE VALUES OF EXPERIMENTALLY DETERMINED DERIVATIVE COEFFICIENTS FOR

OSCILLATING AEROFOILS, ARC R and M 1912, 1943.

Jones, W.P., AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON WINGS IN SIMPLE HARMONIC MOTION, R and M 2026, 1945.

Jones, W.P., AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON WINGS IN NON-UNIFORM MOTION, ARC R and M 2117, August 1945.

Jones, W.P., AEROFOIL OSCILLATIONS AT HIGH MEAN INCIDENCES, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2654, 1948.

Jones, W.P., WIND TUNNEL INTERFERENCE EFFECTS ON MEASURE-MENTS OF AERODYNAMIC COEFFICIENTS FOR OSCILLATING AIRFOILS, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2786, 1950, AD223688.

Jones, W.P., WIND TUNNEL INTERFERENCE EFFECTS ON OSCILLATING AIRFOILS IN SUBSONIC FLOW, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 2943, 1953.

Kaplan, P., A HYDRODYNAMIC THEORY FOR THE FORCES ON HYDRO-FOILS IN UNSTEADY MOTION, Dissertation, Stevens Institute of Tech-nology, 1955.

Karp, S.N., Shu, S.S., and Weil, H., AERODYNAMICS OF THE OSCIL-LATING AIRFOIL IN COMPRESSIBLE FLOW, Technical Report No. F-TR-1167-ND, Air Mat. Com., U.S. Air Force, Oct. 1947.

Katzmayr, Richard, EFFECT OF PERIODIC CHANGES OF ANGLES OF ATTACK ON BEHAVIOR OF AIRFOILS, NACA TM 147, Oct. 1922.

Keating, R.F.A., MEASUREMENT OF PRESSURES ON A DELTA WING OSCILLATING IN HEAVE AT A HIGH ANGLE OF INCIDENCE, RAE Technical Report 67241, 1967, AD665097.

Kuethe, Arnold M., CIRCULATION MEASUREMENTS ABOUT THE TIP OF AN AIRFOIL DURING FLIGHT THROUGH A GUST, NACA TN 685, 1939.

Kussner, H.G., THEORY OF THE OSCILLATING AIRFOIL OF LARGE ASPECT RATIO, Reports and Translations No. 53, M.A.P., Volkenrode, April 15, 1946.

Kussner, H.G., and Schwarz, L., THE OSCILLATING WING WITH AERO-DYNAMICALLY BALANCED ELEVATOR, NACA TM 991, 1941.

Ladeson, C. L., and Lindsey, W.F., INVESTIGATION OF UNSTEADY FLOW PAST FOUR NACA 6 PERCENT THICK AIRFOIL SECTIONS,

Astrophysical Journal, April 1965, AD102205.

Laidlaw, W.R., THEORETICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS ON LOW ASPECT RATIO WINGS OSCILLATING IN INCOMPRESSIBLE FLOW, Aeroelastic and Structures Research Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Technical Report 51-2, September 1954.

Laidlaw, W.R., and Halfman, R.L., EXPERIMENTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS ON OSCILLATING LOW ASPECT RATIO WINGS, <u>Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences</u>, Vol. 23, No. 2, February 1956.

Laschka, B., THE PRESSURE, LIFT AND MOMENT DISTRIBUTIONS ON A HARMONICALLY OSCILLATING SWEPTBACK WING OF LOW ASPECT RATIO AT LOW SUBSONIC SPEEDS, Royal Aircraft Establishment, Library Translation No. 1223, 1967.

Lawrence, H. R., and Gerber, E.H., THE AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON LOW ASPECT RATIO WINGS OSCILLATING IN AN INCOMPRESSIBLE FLOW, Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, Vol. 19, No. 11, November 1352.

Leadbetter, Sumner A., and Clevenson, Sherman A., SOME MEASURE-MENTS AT SUBSONIC SPEEDS OF THE AERODYNAMIC FORCES AND MOMENTS ON TWO DELT. WINGS OF ASPECT RATIOS 2 and 4 OSCIL-LATING ABOUT THE MIDCHORD, NACA RML53J26a, 1953.

Leehey, P., THE HILBERT PROBLEM FOR AN AIRFOIL IN UNSTEADY FLOW, David W. Taylor Model Basin, Washington, D. C., January 1957, AD124295.

Lehrian, D. E., INITIAL LIFT OF FINITE ASPECT-RATIO WINGS DUE TO A SUDDEN CHANGE OF INCIDENCE, ARC R and M 3023, 1955.

LeRoy, H. L., and Scheiman, J., QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF EFFECTS OF HELICOPTER ROTOR BLADE TIP VORTEX ON BLADE AIRLOADS, NASA TN D-1637, May 1963.

Magnuson, A.H., AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE UNSTEADY WAKE BEHIND AN OSCILLATING WING IN TWO DIMENSIONAL, INCOMPRESSIBLE NON-CAVITATING FLOW, File No. TM607.2441-10, The Pennsylvania State University, Ordnance Research Laboratory, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1967, AD650475.

Martuccelli, John R., Mallo-Christensen, Erik, MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC LOADING ON OSCILLATING AIRFOILS IN SUPERSONIC

FLOW, AD138301.

Mazelsky, Bernard, NUMERICAL DETERMINATION OF INDICIAL LIFT OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL AIRFOILS AT SUBSONIC MACH NUMBERS FROM OSCILLATORY LIFT COEFFICIENTS WITH CALCULATIONS FOR MACH NUMBER 0.7, NACA TN 2562, 1951.

Mazelsky, B., DETERMINATION OF INDICIAL LIFT AND MOMENT OF A TWO-DIMENSIONAL PITCHING AIRFOIL AT SUBSONIC MACH NUMBERS FROM OSCILLATING COEFFICIENTS WITH NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS FOR M = 0.7, NACA TN 2613, 1952.

Mazelsky, Bernard, and Drischler, Joseph A., NUMERICAL DETERMINATIONS FOR A TWO-DIMENSIONAL SINKING AND PITCHING AIRFOIL AT MACH NUMBERS 0.5 and 0.6, NACA TN 2739, July 1952.

Mendelson, A., AERODYNAMIC HYSTERESIS AS A FACTOR IN CRITICAL FLUTTER SPEED OF COMPRESSOR BLADES AT STALLING CONDITIONS, Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, No. 16, 1949.

Miles, C.J.W., Bratt, J.B., and Bridgeman, K.B., MEASUREMENTS OF PITCHING OSCILLATION DERIVATIVES AT SUBSONIC AND TRANSONIC SPEEDS FOR A CROPPED DELTA WING OF ASPECT RATIO 1.8, Interim Report, British ARC C.P. 534, February 1960.

Minhinnick, I.T., SUBSONIC AERODYNAMIC DERIVATIVES FOR WINGS AND CONTROL SURFACES, RAE Report Structures 87, July 1950, ARC No. 14, 228.

Molyneus, W.G., and Ruddlesden, F., DERIVATIVE MEASUREMENTS AND FLUTTER TESTS ON A RECTANGULAR WING WITH A FULL SPAN AILERON, RAE Report Structures 172, February 1955.

Molyneus, W.G., and Ruddlesden, F., A TECHNIQUE FOR THE MEASURE-MENT OF PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION ON OSCILLATING AEROFOILS, WITH RESULTS FOR A RECTANGULAR WING OF ASPECT RATIO 3.3, Aeronautical Research Council C. P. 233, 1955.

Moore, F.K., LIFT HYSTERESIS AT STALL AS AN UNSTEADY BOUND-ARY-LAYER PHENOMENON, Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratories, Cleveland, Ohio, November 1955, AD77939.

Nelson, Herbert C., and Berman, Julian H., CALCULATIONS ON THE FORCES AND MOMENTS FOR AN OSCILLATING WING-AILERON COMBINATION IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL POTENTIAL FLOW AT SONIC SPEED, NACA Report 1128, 1953.

Pearcey, H. H., A METHOD FOR THE PREDICTION OF THE ONSET OF BUFFETING AND OTHER SEPARATION EFFECTS FROM WIND TUNNEL TESTS ON RIGID MODELS, Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development Report 223, AD 248342, 1958.

Polyakhov, N.N., THEORY OF A WING OF FINITE SPAN, OSCILLATING HARMONIOUSLY, Foreign Technical Division, Air Force Systems Com., Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, AD610292.

Randall, D.G., A THEORETICAL DETERMINATION OF THE FLOW PAST AND THE AIR FORCES ON AN OSCILLATING SLENDER DELTA WING WITH LEADING EDGE SEPARATION, Royal Aircraft Establishment Report No. Structures 284, March 1963.

Randall, D.G., OSCILLATING SLENDER WINGS IN THE PRESENCE OF LEADING EDGE SEPARATION, Royal Aircraft Establishment Report No. Structures 286, 1963.

Randall, D.G., FORCES ON AEROFOILS WITH BOTH INCIDENCE AND FORWARD SPEED VARYING, Aeronautical Research Council R and M 3914, May 1964.

Reissner, Eric, ON THE GENERAL THEORY OF THIN AIRFOILS FOR NON-UNIFORM MOTION, NACA TN 946, 1944.

Reissner, E., WIND TUNNEL CORRECTIONS FOR THE TWO-DIMEN-SIONAL THEORY OF OSCILLATING AIRFOILS, Report No. SB-318-S-3, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratories, Inc., 22 April 1947.

Reissner, E., and Stevens, J., EFFECT OF FINITE SPAN ON THE AIRLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS FOR OSCILLATING WINGS, VOLUME II, METHODS OF CALCULATION AND EXAMPLES OF APPLICATION, NACA TN 1195, 1947.

Reissner, Eric, ON THE THEORY OF OSCILLATING AIRFOILS OF FINITE SPAN IN SUBSONIC COMPRESSIBLE FLOW, NACA Report 1002, 1950.

Reissner, Eric, ON THE APPLI CATION OF MATHIEU FUNCTIONS IN THE THEORY OF SUBSONIC COMPRESSIBLE FLOW PAST OSCILLATING AIRFOILS, NACA TN 2363, 1951.

Richardson, J.R., A METHOD FOR CALCULATING THE LIFTING FORCES ON WINGS (UNSTEADY SUBSONIC LIFTING SURFACE THEORY), Aeronautical Research Council R and M 3157, 1955.

Rodden, W. P., Hodson, C. H., and Revell, J. D., SUBSONIC AND SONIC AERODYNAMIC INFLUENCE COEFFICIENTS FROM UNSTEADY LIFTING SURFACE THEORY, North American Aviation, Inc., Report NA-57-1104, October 25, 1957.

Rodden, W.P., Farkas, E.F., Malcom, H., and Kiliszewski, A.M., AERODYNAMIC INFLUENCE COEFFICIENTS FROM INCOMPRESSIBLE STRIP THEORY: ANALYTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE, Aerospace Corp., Los Angeles, California, January 1966, AD38171.

Rodden, W.P., Farkas, Edith F., and Malcom, H., HARMONIC GUST AERODYNAMIC INFLUENCE COEFFICIENTS FROM INCOMPRESSIBLE STRIP THEORY: ANALYTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE, Aerospace Corp., 15 September 1962, AD607624.

Rodden, W.P., and Revell, J.D., THE STATUS OF UNSTEADY AERO-DYNAMIC INFLUENCE COEFFICIENTS, Aerospace Corp., Los Angeles, California, November 1961, AD272908.

Rott, N., OSCILLATING AIRFOILS AT MACH NUMBER ONE, <u>Journal of</u> the <u>Aeronautical Sciences</u>, No. 16, 1949.

Runyan, H. L., and Watkins, C. E., CONSIDERATIONS ON THE EFFECT OF WIND-TUNNEL WALLS ON OSCILLATING AIR FORCES FOR TWO-DIMENSIONAL SUBONIC COMPRESSIBLE FLOW, NACA TN 2552, December 1951.

Runyan, Harry L., and Woolston, Donald S., METHOD FOR CALCULATING THE AERODYNAMIC LOADING ON AN OSCILLATING FINITE WING IN SUBSONIC AND SONIC FLOW, NACA Report 1322, 1957.

Schade, Th., and Krienes, K., THE OSCILLATING CIRCULAR AIRFOLL ON THE BASIS OF POTENTIAL THEORY, NACA TM 1098, 1947.

Scherer, M., and Lopez, J., ADVANCES IN TECHNIQUES OF MEASURE-MENT OF AERODYNAMIC DERIVATIVES IN WIND TUNNELS BY THE FORCED OSCILLATION METHOD, NASA TTF-11, 764, 1968.

Sears, W.R., OPERATIONAL METHODS IN THE THEORY OF AIRFOILS IN NON-UNIFORM MOTION, <u>Journal of the Franklin Institute</u>, Vol. 230, July 1940.

Sears, W.R., SOME ASPECTS OF NON-STATIONARY AIRFOIL THEORY AND ITS PRACTICAL APPLICATION, <u>Journal of Aero. Sci.</u>, Vol. 8, No. 3, January 1941.

Shen, S. F., and Crimi, P., THE THEORY FOR AN OSCILLATING THIN AIRFOIL AS DERIVED FROM THE O SEEN EQUATIONS, <u>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</u>, Vol. 23, Part 3, 1965.

Sinnott, C.S., HINGE-MOMENT DERIVATIVES FOR AN OSCILLATING CONTROL, ARC R and M 2923, Parts I and II, 1953.

Spieberg, I.N., THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL INCOMPRESSIBLE AERO-DYNAMIC COEFFICIENTS FOR OSCILLATORY CHANGES IN AIRFOIL CAMBER, Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, No. 20, 1953.

Theodorsen, Theodore, and Garrick, I.E., MECHANISM OF FLUTTER. A THEORETICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE FLUTTER PROBLEM, NACA Report No. 685, 1940.

Theodorsen, T., and Garrick, I.E., NONSTATIONARY FLOW ABOUT A WING-AILERON-TAB COMBINATION INCLUDING AERODYNAMIC BALANCE, NACA Report 736, 1941.

Timman, R., THE AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON AN OSCILLATING AERO-FOIL BETWEEN TWO PARALLEL WALLS, Appl. Sci. Res. (The Hague), Vol. A3, No. 1, 1951.

Timman, R., van de Vooren, A.I., and Greidanus, J.H., AERODYNAMIC COEFFICIENTS OF AN OSCILLATING AIRFOLL IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL SUBSONIC FLOW, Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, No. 21, 1954.

Tobak, Murray, DAMPING IN PITCH OF LOW-ASPECT-RATIO WINGS AT SUBSONIC AND SUPERSONIC SPEEDS, NACA RMA52L04a, 1953.

Tobak, Murray, Reese, David E., Jr., and Beam, Benjamin H., EXPERI-MENTAL DAMPING IN PITCH OF 45° TRIANGULAR WINGS, NACA RMA50J26, 1950.

Troutman, J. L., Lessing, H. C., and Menees, G. P., EXPERIMENTAL DETERMINATION OF THE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION ON A RECTANGULAR WING OSCILLATING IN THE FIRST BENDING MODE FOR MACH NUMBERS FROM 0.24 to 1.30, NASA Technical Note D-344, December 1960.

Van de Vooren, A.I., UNSTEADY AIRFOIL THEORY, Advances in Appl. Mechanics, Vol. V, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1958.

Van Dyke, Milton Denman, SUPERSONIC FLOW PAST OSCILLATING AIR-FOILS INCLUDING NONLINEAR THICKNESS EFFECTS, NACA TN 2982, 1953, AD125282.

Von Karman, Theodore, and Sears, W.R., AIRFOIL THEORY FOR NON-UNIFORM MOTION, <u>Journal of Aero. Sci.</u>, Vol. 5, No. 10, August 1938.

Watkins, C.E., Woolston, D.S., and Cunningham, A SYSTEMATIC KERNEL FUNCTION PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING AERODYNAMIC FORCES ON OSCILLATING OR STEADY FINITE WINGS AT SUBSONIC SPEEDS, NASA TR R-48, 1959.

Watkins, C.E., Runyan, H.L., and Woolston, D.S., ON THE KERNEL FUNCTION OF THE INTEGRAL EQUATION RELATING THE LIFT AND DOWNWARD DISTRIBUTIONS OF OSCILLATING FINITE WINGS IN SUBSONIC FLOW, NACA TN 3131, January 1954.

Whitmarsh, G. E., THE MEASUREMENT OF THE DERIVATIVE ZW FOR OSCILLATING SWEPTBACK WINGS, College of Aeronautics, Cranfield Report, No. 92, 1955.

Wight, K.C., A REVIEW OF SLOTTED-WALL WIND-TUNNEL INTER-FERENCE EFFECTS ON OSCILLATING MODELS IN SUBSONIC AND TRANSONIC FLOWS, NPL Aeronautical Report 1074, Aeronautical Research Council 25, 1938.

Wight, K.C., MEASUREMENTS OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL DERIVATIVES ON A WING AILERON - TAB SYSTEM WITH A 1541 SECTION AERO-FOIL, Part I - Part II, ARC R and M 3029, 1955.

Woolston, Donald S., Clevenson, Sherman A., and Leadbetter, Sumner A., ANALYTICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF AERODYNAMIC FORCES AND MOMENTS ON LOW-ASPECT-RATIO WINGS UNDERGOING FLAPPING OSCILLATIONS. NACA TN 4302, 1958.

Woolston, D.S., and Runyan, H. L., SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE AIR FORCES ON A WING OSCILLATING BETWEEN TWO WALLS FOR SUBSONIC COMPRESSIBLE FLOW, Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, Vol. 22, No. 1, January 1955.

Wright, J.G., LOW SPEED WIND TUNNEL MEASUREMENTS OF THE OSCILLATORY LONGITUDINAL DERIVATIVES OF A GOTHIC WING OF ASPECT RATIO 0.75, Bristol Aircraft Company, Report W.T. 368, September 1961.

APPENDIX I CORRELATION OF OSCILLATING AIRFOIL DATA

In attempting to compare experimental data from various sources, two problem areas exist. The first of these is the large number of parameters involved: oscillating frequency, oscillating amplitude, test Reynolds number, airfoil profile, and pitch-axis location. The second problem area is in the type of data reported. That is, some investigators present only lift information, whereas others present only moment data. Oddly enough, early work in this country was concerned only with lift in pure pitch; whereas the British investigators measured only moments in pure pitch. A study of Table II, a tabular summary of experimental work, will point out the extent of the problems encountered in correlating or comparing experimental results.

Theoretical values of the aerodynamic coefficients provide one basis for comparison of the experimental results. Linearized theory applies to very thin wings undergoing small oscillations in an inviscid fluid. With these limitations in mind, comparison may be made between theory and low-speed investigations of airfoils oscillating about low mean angles of attack. For purposes of this report, the theory of Theodorsen³ has been used as a guide.

Experimental work on oscillating airfoils is complicated by the difficulty in obtaining pure harmonic motions and the problems associated with measuring the forces and moments. In addition to these obstacles, calculation of tunnel wall corrections is a formidable task, so most data are presented uncorrected. The experimental difficulties coupled with the theoretical approximations result in a standard, of what is considered to be good agreement, being set rather low. Results presented in the investigations of this survey for airfoils operating at small mean angles of incidence (such that the stall angle is not exceeded) show qualitative agreement with the linearized theory.

Halfman⁸ presents an excellent survey of the first six references of Table II. In order to compare the data, he had to modify them to agree in form and correct for the differences in pitch-axis location used by the various investigators. In correcting for the pitch-axis location, Halfman had to resort to theoretical considerations since there were insufficient experimental data to perform the required transfers. After applying the corrections, there was still a large difference in Reynolds number. Lift and moment data were then plotted against Reynolds number for various reduced frequencies to provide a comparison. These plots from Halfman's report have been reproduced here as Figures 32 and 33. In Figure 32 the curves labeled (S) are from the work of Reid and Vencenti¹¹ and Reid¹², those labeled (M) from the work of Halfman⁸, and those labeled (T) from the theory of Theodorsen³. Considering the corrections required to

modify the data and the fact that the airfoils are slightly different profiles, Figure 32 shows remarkable agreement in the trends. In Figure 33, the curves labeled (B₁) are from the data of Bratt and Scruton⁹, those labeled (B₂) from Bratt and Wight¹³, those labeled (M) from Halfman⁸, and those labeled (T) from theory. In the moment phase angle portion of Figure 33, it may be noted that the data of Reid and Vencenti¹¹ and Reid¹² show remarkable agreement, where is those of Bratt and Scruton⁹ do not agree as well. The moment magnitude data are not as consistent as the moment phase angle data. An interesting point in the moment magnitude data is that a sharp increase in magnitude with Reynolds number occurs at the higher reduced frequencies for all three sets of data presented. No explanation of this phenomenon is offered. Again, it should be borne in mind that the data from the three sources compared in Figure 33 are not for the same airfoil profiles.

In an attempt to determine the effects of airfoil profile, lift and moment data from Halfman⁸ and Halfman et al⁵ have been compared in Figures 34 and 35 respectively. Data presented are for four different profiles of the same thickness ratio obtained from the same test facility. Whereas qualitative agreement with theory may be noted, the scatter of the data precludes any possibility of determining the effects of airfoil profile. Along this same line, data from Wyss and Monfort¹⁷ are presented in Figures 36 and 37. The data presented are for five airfoils with thickness and chordwise location of maximum thickness varied systematically. Although the data presented are for a Mach number 0.491, the compressibility effects should be quite small since the mean angle of incidence (2°) and the oscillating amplitude (1°) are small. Once again, there is qualitative agreement with theory but too much scatter in the data to arrive at any conclusions regarding the effects of profile.

No other attempt has been made to compare the data from the surveys listed in Table II because of the lack of conformity of the parameters involved and the fact that each investigation is compared with theory in the individual reports.

Three references (5, 6, and 9) listed in Table II present data for airfoils oscillating at high angles of attack such that the airfoil is operating in the stalled region part of the time. It may be noted from the table that the pitch-axis location is different for each investigation. Since there is no theoretical correction which can be applied to account for the different pitch-axis location for airfoils oscillating at large angles of attack, the data cannot be compared directly. While References 5 and 9 present moment data, besides the difference in pitch-axis location, they are for different airfoil shapes and different Reynolds numbers. Data presented from the investigations reported in References 5 and 6 were for the same airfoil shape. Whereas normal force is presented for instantaneous angles

of attack in Reference 6, corresponding data are not presented in Reference 5. So here again, there is no chance for direct comparison.

In addition to the tabular summary (Table II) of two-dimensional, low-speed, experimental oscillating airfoil investigations, tabular summaries are presented in Tables III-V for experimental investigations of two-dimensional oscillating airfoils in compressible flow and finite wings oscillating in low speed and compressible flow. Tables III-V are not intended to represent a complete survey. They are a summary of investigations that were brought to attention during the search for low-speed two-dimensional investigations and are included in this report for convenience. No attempt is made to correlate these summaries.

In conclusion, while there is considerable low-speed experimental data on oscillating two-dimensional airfoils, there is very little that can be directly correlated. This is due to the number of parameters involved and the choice of data recorded by the investigators. In cases where direct correlation is possible, scatter of the data restricts the possibility of any definite conclusions. Whereas qualitative agreement with linearized theory is indicated in most cases, quantitative agreement is hampered by the theoretical assumptions and the difficulty of obtaining accurate experimental data.

				TABLE II.	OSCILI	JATING AIRFOIL,	SUMMARY OF
Ref. No.	Airfoil Section	Chord In.	RN/10 ⁶ Range	Pitch Axis % C	ā Deg.	Δα Deg.	Trans. Amp. In.
9	15% Joukowski	9	. 09 28	50	0-20	2.1-10	N/A
10	18% Symmetrical	5, 188	. 06 3	25	0		N/A
11	NACA 0015	15	. 14 30	40	0,-5	2.5-7.5	N/A
12	NACA 0015	10 & 15	. 137-1. 028	30 & 40	0-10	1-5	N/A
13	15% Joukowski, 15% EC1550, 15% Elliptical, 15% Hollow-Ground	9	. 142 283	33,3 & 50	0-18	2-6	N/A
8	NACA 0012	12	.7 - 1.0	37	0, 6. 1	5.19,6.7 & 13.5	1.0, 1.37, 2.0
5	12% Symmetrical Sharp Intermediate Blunt	12	.7 -1.0	37	0-22	6.08	0.9
14	7.3% Symmetrical	11.7	. 08 -1. 0	Varied	0	.95-1.9	. 63
6	NACA 0012	24.5	3.0 - 6.0	25	0-33	4-8	N/A
15	NACA 0018	4	0.2-1.2	25	0	. 5	N/A
36	NACA 632A615	8		18.75 & 32.1	9.0	. 78 96	N/A



IARY OF LOW-SPEED EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

				Dat	a Pres	sented			
ns. o. In.	Freq. CPS	k	Instrumentation	Lift	N. Force	Drag	Moment	Phase Angle	Remarks
/A	0-11	075	Magneto-Striction Stress Indicator			-	x		Virtual Mass Effect of Air is Cancelled Out of Data
'A	17	. 07 7	Spring Deflection					x	
/A	4.24 & 8.82	.295	Dynamometer	x				x	
'A	6.6-15	.2-2.0	Dynamometer	x				x	
/A	0-11	0785	Magneto-Striction Stress Indicator				X		
. 37,2. 0	0-17	.0546	Strain Gage	x		x	x	x	Combined Pitch and Translation
9	2-18	. 05-, 55	Strain Gage	x		x	x	x	
63	4.17 & 8.33	.08-1.0	Electro-Dynamic Pickup				x	x	Combined Pitch and Translation in Rept. F. 102
'A	0-16	.063	Pressure Trans- ducers		x		x		
'A	15	. 04-2.4	Piezo-Electric Gages	x			x	x	Water Tunnel
'A	18.61-19.5	.746- 2.66	Strain Gage	X			x		



TABLE III. OSCILLATING AIRFOIL, SUMMARY OF COMPRESSIBLE FLOW I

											١
Ref. No.	Airfoil Section	Chord In.	Mach No.	RN/10 ⁶ Range	Pitch Axis % C	ā Deg.	Δα Deg.	Trans. Amp. In.	Freq. CPS	k	Instrumentation
16	Bi-Convex	2	0.4-0.9 1.275	. 4 8	50	0	2-4	N/A	8-27	0 015	Photocell
17	NACA 65A012 65A008 2-008 877A008 65A004	24	. 5 9	5.0-8.0	25	0, 2	1	N/A	4-40	. 025- 0. 45	Pressure Transducers
4	NACA 65A012 65A008 2-008 877A008 65A004	24	. 2 86	3.0-8.0	25	4-10	i	N/A	4-40	. 03- 1. 12	Pressure Transducers
18	NACA 65A012 65A008 2-008 877A008	24	.59	5.0-8.0	25	2	1	N/A	4-40	. 025- 0. 45	Pressure Transducers
19	NACA 65-010	12	. 35 70	5.0	50	0	1.2, 2.4	N/A	0-60	08	Pressure Transducers
20	NACA 65A010	12	. 35 70	5.3	50	0-16	1.2	N/A	10-35	064	Pressure Transducers
21	NACA 65-010	8	. 35 78	1.0- 5.5	25	0	2.3	N/A		. 17- . 35	Strain Gages Wattmeter
22	Blunt-Nosed Wedge	2.5	1.75- 2.47	0.9	Varied	0		N/A	20	. 12	Light Beams
23	Double Wedge	3	8,8	1.0	50	0	3	N/A	125	. 018	Strain Gage
24	Double Wedge Single Wedge		1.37- 2.43		Varied	0	1	N/A			



AIRFOIL, SUMMARY OF COMPRESSIBLE FLOW EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

					Dat	a Pres	ented			
Trans. Amp. In	Freq.	k	Instrumentation	Lift	N. Force	Drag	Moment	Phase Angle	Damping	Remarks
N/A	8-27	0 015	Photocell						х	Measured Model Dis- placement
N/A	4-40	. 025- 0. 45	Pressure Transducers	x			x	х		
N/A	4-40	. 03- 1. 12	Pressure Transducers	x			x	x		
N/A	4-40	. 025- 0. 45	Pressure Transducers	x			x	x		Effect of Spoilers on Oscillating Airfoils
N/A	0-60	08	Pressure Transducers	x			x	x		
N/A	10-35	064	Pressure Transducers		x		х	x		
N/A		. 17- . 35	Strain Gages Wattmeter	x			x	x		
N/A	20	. 12	Light Beams						х	Measured Model Dis- placement
N/A	125	. 018	Strain Gage							
N/A						x				




Ref. No.	Airfoil Section	Chord In,	AR	TR	ē/4	Spa Semi		RN/10 ⁶ Range	Pitch Axis % C	ā Deg.	Δα Deg.	Trans Amp. I
25					·			0. 9	50	2.08.		
25	15% Thick		10 6	$\frac{1.0}{1.0}$	0 0			0.9	50			
			4	1.0	0							
			2	1.0	0							
			1	1.0	0							
9	15% Joukow- ski	9	2.7	1.0	0		24.3	. 19- . 08	50	0, 6	5-10	N/A
13	15% Joukow-											
10	ski, EC 1550	9	1.0	1.0	0		9	. 14 28	50	0, 8,	6	N/A
	DRI, EC 1000	U	2.0	1.0	0		18	,	00	10	·	11/11
			3.0	1.0	0		27			10		
			3.5	1.0	0		31. 5					
			4. 4	1.0	0		39.6					
26	NACA 0020	3.75	3	1.0	0			. 1 35	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.8
		3.75	4	1.0	0		15.0					
		3.75	5	1.0	0		18.75					
		3.75	3	1.0	45		11.25					
		3.75	5	1.0	45		18.75		. '			
27	8% Gethic		. 75						30, 45	0-20		N/A
	5% Gothic		. 75						60			
28	RAE 102		1. 2	14				. 75-				
								1. 5	.754	0-15	. 9-4. 4	N/A
									. 973			
	RAE 102	24	1.6	0			33.6 1	l. 2	. 862*	0-15	2-4.7	
	RAE 102	21	1. 32	46			38.5	. 7	1.112	0-15	1. 15-	
									. 883**		5. 15	
	RAE 102, 10%	13.4	2.97	14	36.9		40.2	. 7-2. 2	. 328	0	1.65	1. 0-
			•••						. 055	·		2.0
	RAE 101, 6%	21, 3	3.0	1. 0	60		64		. 288	0	1.70	
	EQ 10, 40, 10%		4.4	. 31			97.5		. 258	0	1.70	
									. 572 [#]			
30	RAE 101	20	3.3	1. 0	0	33.5		. 4-1. 5	0	0	2.0	N/A



								Data Pre	sented		
xis	ā Deg.	Δa Deg.	Trans. Amp. In.	Freq. CPS	k	Instru- mentation	Lift	Moment	Phase Angle	Damping	Remarks
					0.35		X	х	х		Pitch and Heave
	0, 6	5-10	N/A	0-10.3	0506	Magneto Striction Stress In- dicator		х			
	0, 8, 10	6	N/A	0-11	078	Magneto Striction Stress In- dicator			x		
	N/A	N/A	0.8		. 025- . 25	Light Beam				x	Measured Mode Displacement
	0-20		N/A		0 7		x	x			
	0-15	. 9-4. 4	N/A		. 03-		- - -			••	allowed B.V.
	0-15	2-4.7			. 375 . 03- . 375	Light Beams	зх			Х	Clipped Delta Wing 6%, Delta Wing 6%
	0-15	1. 15- 5. 15			. 03-						Arrowhead win
	0	1.65	1.0- 2.0	0-2.97	008	Strain Gages	зХ	x		x	Only 90° Delta Wing Heaved
	0	1.70	-	0-2.97	0 13						
	0	1. 70		0-2.97	0 13						Measurements Made Using Fr and Forced Os
	0	2.0	N/A		. 2 65	Force Trans	3-				cillations




						TA	BLE V.	OSCILL	ATING WIN	G, SUI	MMARY	OF CO
		Wing	Chara	cterist	ics							
Ref. No.	Airfoil Section	Chord In.	AR	TR	c/4 Deg.	Semi- , Span In,	Mach No.	RN/10 ⁶ Range	Pitch Axis % C	ā Deg.	Δa Deg.	Trans
31	NACA 16-004	5 5, 35 5, 78 7, 07	5. 4 5. 04 4. 05 2. 7	1. 0 1. 0 1. 0 1. 0	0 15 30 45	13.5 13.5 11.7 9.53	. 042- . 794	. 049- 5. 34	25 32.5 50 75	0-24	3	N/A
	NACA 65A004	8 8 8	4.5	1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0	0 0 0 0	24 21 18 15						
32	NACA 65A010	12	2	1.0	0	12	. 18- . 75	.9-9.5	50	,0		N/A
33	NACA 65A010	12	2	1.0	0	12	. 15- . 81	.6-9.21	50	0	1,24- 2,11	N/A
34	NACA 65A005	40	3	0.5	0	45	. 4- 1. 07	6-10.2	50	0-10	1.5	N/A
35	5% Bi- convex	5.11	3	. 07	49. 1 [*]	7.71	1.2-2.0	4.0	44.5	0	. 8- 1. 6	N/A
1	Delta Wings	5, 85 6, 87	2 1. 25	. 07	60. 0** 70. 1**	5.89 4.30			76.8** 49.3** 72.7** 49.3			
	5% Bi-	5.30	3	. 238	49.1	7.99			86.4** 51.3**			
	Swept Wings	6.05	2	. 238	60. 0	6.09			82.7			
		7.07	1.25	. 238	70. 1	4.42			81. 7** 55. 4**			



IMARY OF COMPRESSIBLE FLOW EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

						Data Pr	esente	i	
Δa Deg	Trans. . Amp. In.	Freq. CPS	k	Instrumen- tation	Lift	Moment	Phase Angle	Damping	Remarks
3	N/A	35-175	. 15-1. 3	Strain Gages				Х	Flutter Tests
	N/A		.05657	Strain Gages	x	х	X		Wing With Tip Tank
1.24 2.11	•	31-62	. 15-1. 32	Strain Gages	x	x	x		
1.5	N/A	12.5	. 008- . 269	Pressure Trans.	x	x	X		
. 8- 1. 6	N/A	35-70	. 054- . 187	Dampo- meter			X		








FIGURE 32. Reynolds Number Effect - Lift in Pure Pitch.




FIGURE 33. Reynolds Number Effect - Moment in Pure Pitch.




FIGURE 34. Airfoil Profile Effect - Lift in Pure Pitch, $\bar{\alpha}$ = 0°, $\Delta \alpha$ = 6.08°, Pitch Axis = 37% Chord.




Fig. 35. Airfoil Profile Effect - Moment in Pure Pitch, $\bar{\alpha} = 0^{\circ}$, $\Delta \alpha = 6.08^{\circ}$, Pitch Axis = 37% Chord.




FIGURE 36. Effect of Airfoil Thickness - Lift in Pure Pitch, M = .491, $\bar{a} = 2^{\circ}$, Pitch Axis = 25% Chord.




FIGURE 37. Effect of Thickness Distribution - Lift in Pure Pitch, M = .491, $\tilde{\alpha}$ = 2°, Pitch Axis = 25% Chord.

APPENDIX II EFFECT OF TUBING ON THE REMOTE READING OF OSCILLATING PRESSURES*

INTRODUCTION

In order to support the investigation of the pressure distribution over an oscillating airfoil, it is desirable to have a knowledge of the effect of tubing size and diameter upon the response of a remotely located transducer at various frequencies of airfoil oscillation. There are two aspects to the response -- attenuation of the pressure and pressure lag. For this investigation, the term pressure attenuation is defined as the ratio of the remote pressure to the local or reference pressure.

It was hoped that, in order to keep the amount of recording equipment to a minimum, lengths of tubing could be led from the pressure orifices on the wind-tunnel model to a scanivalve and single transducer located outside the wind tunnel.

During the course of the investigation, it was decided that it would be useful to have an idea of the error encountered when transducers are mounted inside the model and connected to the orifices by short lengths of tubing.

EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS AND PROCEDURE

The apparatus consisted of a sinusoidally oscillating piston which was driven by a Scotch-yoke mechanism. Two differential pressure transducers (Statham Model No. PM $131TC \pm 2.5-350$) were used, one whose diaphragm was mounted flush with the end of the piston cylinder and another that was connected to the cylinder through lengths of flexible tubing. The signals of both pressure transducers were first fed into a multichannel carrier amplifier and thence into a recording oscillograph. Calibration of the recording system was accomplished by comparing readings from a water-filled manometer with stepped oscillograph traces.

The experimental investigation consisted of three phases. The first phase examined the effects of tubing length and oscillation frequency -- the remote *ransducer being mounted in a scanivalve. The second phase examined the effects of tubing length and frequency of oscillation amplitude - the remote transducer being mounted in a special holder. The third phase examined the effects of tube diameter, frequency of oscillation, oscillation

Dagold, Reuben G., RESEARCH MEMORANDUM 1967-4, Wind Tunnel Operations Department, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 1967.

amplitude, and tubing connection position (i.e., to the flush diaphragm face of the transducer and to the plug side of the diaphragm) with a short length of tubing -- the remote transducer again being mounted in the special holder.

The repeatability of the data between runs using the scanivalve (first phase) was poor (see Figures 38 and 39). A very flexible rubber gasket is used to seal the inlet tubes of the scanivalve. The gasket can partially restrict the opening; the extent of the restriction changes each time that the seal is tightened and also varies from port to port. Thus, it was surmised that the poor repeatability might be attributed to the scanivalve design.

A special holder was made that avoided the varying restriction problem of the scanivalve. Use of the holder during the second phase produced good repeatability of data (see Figures 40 and 41).

The entire investigation was conducted at a mean pressure level of one atmosphere, that being the pressure in the cylinder where the piston is at midstroke. It was at that piston position and pressure that phase-lag data were obtained. The phase lag is defined here as the amount, in degrees, that the remotely read pressure lags the pressure recorded in the cylinder. By amplitude, one-half the difference between the maximum and minimum pressures is meant.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

It was noted that phase lag varies during a cycle and that although the piston motion was sinusoidal, the pressure did not vary sinusoidally. Figure 42 provides an example of lag variation over the cycle (the curves have been normalized). It is evident here that, for the remote pressure reading, the time for the pressure to decrease from the maximum to the minimum is greater than the time for the pressure to increase from the minimum to the maximum. This is substantiated by Larcombe and Peto³⁷, who state that for a constant absolute value of difference between the initial pressure in the tube and the applied pressure, a pressure drop leads to a longer response time than the corresponding pressure rise - because the equilibrium process takes a longer time near the lower final pressure. Thus, the plots presenting phase lag show two points per run per frequency as an indication of the range of variation. Both points were obtained at the piston midstroke position (or zero normalized pressure in Figure 42) -- one 180 degrees from the other.

Figure 43 presents a sample readout from the flush-mounted piston transducer and illustrates the fact that the pressure did not vary sinusoidally. By assuming Boyles's Law to be valid here, it can be shown that the non-sinusoidal variation is to be expected:

$$pV = p_0 V_0$$

where p = pressure

V = volume

subcript of denotes condition at piston milstroke

The volume at any instant can be expressed in terms of the angular position of the crank θ ,

$$V = V_0 + \Delta V \sin \theta$$
$$= V_0 (1 + V' \sin \theta)$$

where $V' = \Delta V/V_0$ Substituting this value of V into the original equation,

$$p = p_0 / (1 + V' \sin \theta)$$

Expanding and neglecting higher order terms of $V^{\mbox{\tiny I}}$, the expression can be written

$$p - p_0 = -p_0 V' \sin \theta (1 - V' \sin \theta)$$

Note that as V' becomes small, p - p_0 approaches - p_0 V' sin θ . However, for this investigation, V' was not small.

A report of some interest is that of Bergh and Tijdeman³⁸, wherein are presented results of theoretical and experimental investigations of the relationship between the sinusoidal pressure disturbance in a given volume and an adjoining volume. However, the theoretical approach employed very small sinusoidal disturbances. The present investigation employed disturbances of an order of magnitude greater, more realistically simulating the disturbances in the wind tunnel.

Examining Figures 38 through 41, the following trends are noted:

- 1. The pressure attenuation peaks (first resonance peak) occur at lower frequencies as the tube length is increased, and the peak values decrease with increasing tube length.
- 2. The phase lag increases with increasing tube length and with increasing frequency.
- 3. The amplitude of the oscillating pressure has a significant effect upon pressure attenuation and phase lag -- the effect being more pronounced with the greater tube length.

In addition to trends (1) and (2) stated above, Bergh and Tijdeman indicate that pressure attenuation and phase lag are functions of pressure level. Pressure level was not varied during this investigation. Trend (3), however, is not noted by them, probably due to the small magnitude of pressure disturbuance that they imposed.

The results of the short (6-inch) tubing investigation are presented in Figures 44 and 45. It is immediately obvious that connecting to the plug side of the transducer produces greater phase lag and greater deviation of attenuation from 1.00, probably because of the larger volume between the tubing and the diaphragm. Within the frequency range (up to 32 cycles per second), mean amplitudes (61 and 31 inches of water), and tube diameters (.049 and .094 inch) tested, phase lag and attenuation appear to be nearly independent of amplitude and diameter for the flush diaphragm face connection. The pressure attenuation varied from 1.00 to 1.02 nearly linearly with increasing frequency, and the remote pressure lagged the actual pressure by an amount that varied from 0 to 2-1/2 degrees nearly linearly with increasing frequency. Also, the phase lag showed only a slight variation over a cycle.

CONCLUSIONS

Since the scanivalve gasket restriction of the ports has a strong effect upon the data, the use of the scanivalve and single transducer is in all likelihood precluded.

In addition to being functions of tube geometry and frequency of oscillation, pressure attenuation and phase lag are also functions of pressure level, amplitude of pressure oscillation, and portion of cycle. Therefore, it would be a very difficult task to determine the instantaneous local oscillating pressure from remote readings.

For the above reasons, it is highly unlikely that a scanivalve and/or transducers mounted outside the wind tunnel can be employed. It would be necessary to mount transducers inside the model, where there would still be need for short tubing to connect some of the orifices. This connecting tubing should be kept as short as possible and should not exceed the 6-inch length tested. By directly using the remotely read data of the short tubing, the ensuing errors would be within acceptable bounds. The error level could be reduced by assuming an average or constant lag throughout the cycle, shifting the oscillating pressure curve the appropriate amount, and applying an attenuation factor (which would be the reciprocal of the attenuation).




FIGURE 38. Pressure Attenuation, Influence of Tube Length, Using Scanivalve, Mean Pressure Amplitude 61 in. H₂0, Tube Diameter 0.049 in.




FIGURE 39. Phase Lag, Influence of Tube Length, Using Scanivalve, Mean Pressure Amplitude 61 in. H₂0, Tube Diameter 0.049 in.




FIGURE 39. Continued.




FIGURE 39. Continued.




FIGURE 40. Pressure Attenuation, Influence of Tube Length and Pressure Amplitude, Tube Diameter 0.049 in.




FIGURE 41. Phase Lag, Influence of Tube Length and Pressure Amplitude, Tube Diameter 0.049 in.




FIGURE 42. Variation of Phase Lag Over Cycle.




FIGURE 43. Sample of Actual Pressure Versus Crank Position, Flush-Mounted Piston Transducer.

PRESSURE - INCHES OF WATER

128




FIGURE 44. Pressure Attenuation, Short Tubing Length (6 in.)




FIGURE 45. Phase Lag, Short Tubing Length (6 in.).

APPENDIX III INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

For the instantaneous pressure coefficient data sheets, the symbols are defined as follows:

AA Angle of attack, α

DELTA AA Oscillating Amplitude, Δα

MEAN AA Mean angle of attack, $\bar{\alpha}$

NOTE: X/C equals .01 is really .0075. This was rounded off to

.01 for tabulation purposes only.

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	50	K = .0320	DEL	DELT AA =	4.01	MEAN AA	20			
AA,	20	• 83	1.80	2.63	3.27	3.67	3.80	3.67	3.27	2.63	1.80	.83
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	96,	.93	.93	.88	•76	.71	69.	.71	•76	88	• 95	•95
•01	.77	09.	•30	*0	22	42	55	52	45	32	•04	•27
•05	•12	16	41	99•-	91	-1.06	-1.17	-1.13	-1.02	99	99	45
•05	27	64	71	83	92	-1.01	-1.04	-1.04	-1.01	86*-	86	71
•10	22	32	740-	57	64	72	75	75	75	68	57	140-
•15	-001	11	14	21	28	31	35	35	-,31	31	21	-,18
•20	36	45	55	-•61	67	74	7	41.	74	70	58	55
•25	45	48	53	56	62	65	65	65	62	62	56	51
•35	33	40	46	640-	53	56	56	56	56	56	46	94
• 45	30	37	04	04.	04	14	140-	140-	14	74	04	37
09•	24	31	31	35	35	35	38	35	38	35	31	-•35
•75	38	42	42	42	46	46	46	46	45	46	42	42
• 90	11	11	11	-•11	80	11	-111	11	-11	11	80	11
1.00	0000	0000	0000	00.0	00.00	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00	• 90	•93	•93	.88	•76	•71	69•	.71	•76	.88	• 95	•95
•01	•24	.55	.73	• 86	•89	.92	.92	.92	•89	• 86	• 79	•61
•02	27	01	•20	•39	•50	.57	•61	•57	.53	•42	•31	•05
•05	55	32	17	02	.08	•12	•15	•12	•12	•01	13	28
•10	56	43	29	-•20	13	07	03	67	13	-•20	26	36
• 15	50	41	-,31	24	21	14	11	14	-,18	24	31	37
•20	54	41	38	31	28	22	19	19	25	28	35	41
•25	52	41	38	29	29	24	-,21	24	27	29	35	41
935	04.	37	-,31	28	25	22	16	22	25	25	-,31	37
•45	39	29	26	26	23	23	19	23	26	23	26	32
09•	21	17	13	-•13	13	-•10	-•10	-•10	17	10	17	17
•75	14	11	14	-•11	11	08	05	-111	14	08	-•11	14
06.	+00-	02	02	02	02	000	0000	02	-005	0000	05	02
1.00	000	000	00.0	00•0	0000	0000	0000	00.00	0000	00.0	000	00.0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				NA I CH T	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	E COEFFIC	TENTS				
		RUN NO	50	K = .0320		DELT AA =	4.01	MEAN AA	1 =20			
*	19	-1.23	-2.20	-3.03	-3.67	-4.07	-4,20	-4.07	-3.67	-3.03	-2.20	-1,23
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	• 95	.88	.71		•31	.17	•05	-07	.21	643	147	78
•01	•50	•73	.83		.87	.93	90	06	6			
•05	19	•02	•23		•52	• 62	99•	99•	999		9 4	270
•05	1.55	-•30	15		60•	•15	.21	.21	81.	15		
•10	39	25	15	07	•05	000	60.	60.	60	90	900	200
•15	11	01	•05		•12	•18	•18	.18	15		12	
•20	52	-•36	30		20	14	11	-111	-111	-14	273	200
•25	51	39	-,36		27	24	22	22	22	- 24	100	
•35	43	-•37	30		24	21	21	21	- 21	- 21	75.7	
• 45	37	-•30	23		23	19	-19	-19	23	101	36	
•	28	21	24		21	-18	18	-118	18	1 1 8	1,21	270
•75	38	34	34		34	-134	46	46	7	0 0 0	17.	47°-
• 90	08	-•08	08		-05	-08	800-	800	4	000	700	9.00
1.00	0000	00.0	00.0		00.00	00.0	0000					
							•		•		000	
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00•	•95	. 88	.71			-11	505	700		7	;	í
•01	•36	•00	24			-1-14	-1.29	-1.20		74		•
•05	7	42	71			-1-49	-1.57	-1.49		1	100	-03
•05	4	58	81			-1.26	-1-29	-1.26		10.02	000	
.10	64.	62	75	88	95	-1.05	-1.08	-1.08	-1-01	- 9 1	75	1000
•15	4	54	64			87	90	90	- 83	77	74.	
• 20	ູ	57	64			-,80	86	83	77	74	79-	1 1
629	4.	52	60			71	77	74	68	- 68	941	
66.	•	43	48			60	63	63	57	54	940-	44
•	. ·	35	39			48	51	48	48	45	39	3.5
9 0	7	-11	21			24	24	28	28	-224	- 2	
	7 (14	14			17	20	20	17	20	14	41.0-
200	20	200	-005			+00-	07	07	04	+00-	200-	200
00	2	0000	000			0000	000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUR RO	21	K0513	DELT	*	4.02	MEAN AA	MEAN AA =20			
**	20	•	1.00	5.	3.28	3.68	3.81	3.68	3.28	2.64	1.81	*8
i						UPPER	SURFACE					
8	••	.93	.93	•	.61	_	•	•71	.78	60	0	0
10.	~	•	2	0000	25	4	5		39		-	
·05	0	•	1	22	16	1.0		-	66-		5	١.
•0•	?	•	•	86	92	0	1.0		98	6		۵ ۱
01.	~	•	4	57	64	9	7.		68	9	3	-
.15	•	•	7	24	28	.2	63		31	2	2	- ۱
•50		•	5	61	67	9		74	67	9	5	4 4
•29	•	•	.5	56	59	5	9.		59	5	S	-
•35	5	•	4	64	64	3	2		53	4	1	
.45	3	•	04	040-	04	4	44		040-	6	3	
0	7	•	6	31	35	6	4		35	6	2	1
.75		•	•	42	42	4	4		42	4	1	4
•	9	•	7	14	•	0	~		80-	9	9	
7.00	Ō	0000	•	00.0	0000	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
• 00	•	•	0	.88	10.	-	•	.71	.78	40	693	060
6	N	5	•70	•86	0	0	4	680	.95		• 76	58
°05		0	Ň	•39	3	5	5	.61	•53	•45	• 28	•05
00.	•	M)	7	•	0	~	-	•12	•12	0	•	28
0	ů		7	•	~ •	0	•	07	10	Ä	•	43
610	ů	•		•	┥.	-		14	18	N		41
020	ů	*	6	•	N	~	?	22	22	2	•	44.
\$5	*	4	•	29	N	2	• 2	24	27	3		43
•35	*	ů.	6	•	N	2		19	22	~	•	37
•			7	•	-	N	•2	19	19	N		32
9 (7	7	•	•	-	•	-10	-•10	-	•	-117
	7	7	-	•	0	0	7	11	08	_	•	14
000	0000	000	000	•	700	700	-05	02	-05	05	05	100-
•		•		•	•	2	Ş	3:	3.5	0	•	800

•	n
	_
3	Z
i	-
:	
i	i
	_
ï	_
•	•
•	٠.
ķ	ב ב
•	2
•	J
L	ų
•	×
:	3
	とうつか
ū	אאר
ī	2
2	ĩ
•	_
	^
3	ĸ
2	K
ž	3
4	Ĕ
3	Ĕ
•	ζ
٠	_
3	Ę
•	C
١	-
U	7
Ź	2

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	COEFFIC	:IENTS				
		RUN NO	21	K = .0513		DELT AA =	4.02	MEAN AA =	1 =20			
AA X/C	19	-1.23	-2.20	-3.04	-3.68	-4.08	-4.21	4.08	-3.68	-3.04	-2.21	-1.24
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	• 90	•	•	•38	~	•00	100	•1•	•28	.47	•69	.63
•01	09•	•		9	0	.93	•93	.93	06.	.93	06.	.87
-02	9	_	3	84.	•59	9	99•	• 70	•62	-	. 41	30
•02	4	Ñ	0	•05	\blacksquare	2	.21	.21	.18	0	90-	-
•10		7	0	0000	0	•00	•13	•00	600	. 0	07	15
•15	08	01	•09	•12	•12	.18	•10	.18	.16	•12	80	-05
•20			N	-•20		-	08	11	111	N	27	30
•25	*		3	24	~	.2	19	19	19	7	30	92
•35			N	24	N	7	17	17	17	7	27	30
• 45	6	7		23	~	7	16	12	16	7	23	-226
• 60	7	~	7	10	-	7	11	14	14	7	21	21
.75		Ģ		34	3	6	30	30	34		34	-134
06.	•	•		05	3	0	-0°-	20	05	0	0	-
1.00	0	•	0	00.0	0	0	00.0	0000	00.00	0	00.0	00.0
										,		
						LOVER	SURFACE					
0	0.6		.67	•38	.21		•	•14	.28	. 47	•69	
100	7	9	*		1.1		ä	~	•	•	30	90.
70.	7.	ָיַ י		-1.20	1.3		=	~	•	;	83	64
60.	ů.	•		-	-1.26	-1.29	-1.29	-1.22	;	-1.03	61	62
	•	•	9 1	- 675	0.1		;	~	•	•	78	62
010	,	•	-	0 1			•	83	•	•	64	54
	Ņ.	•	•	1			•	77	•	•	67	54
570		•	9	12.	•		•	71	•	•	60	54
	•	•	Ç	09.	•		•	57	•	•	94	43
		W.	*	901	•		•	48	•	•	35	35
•	7.	7.	7	32	N		28	28	•		21	21
•75	7	7	?	-•20	~		17	17	•	•	14	11
5		0	0	07	0	100	02	02	100-	+6+-	02	02
00.1	0	0	•	0000	0	•	00.0	000	•	•	00.0	800

INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				AN ICK	AMENOS	PRE SOORI	INDIAMIANEUUS PRESSORE COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	22	K = .0754		DELT AA .	4.03	MEAN AA	20			
*	20	•	1.01	2.64	3.28	3.69	3.62	3.69	3.29	59.5	1.61	•
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	•	.90	•	:	.01	69.	69.	.71	-	.83		000
.01	Õ	09.	•	\$	19		•	45		12	*1	9
•05	0	•	*	990-	61		-	~	•	77	•	•
•02	~	•	•	83	92	•		-1.01	6	69		•
01:	7	•		57	57	•	•	3.	9	57		
• 15	0	•	7	21	21		•	31	•	21	•	
•20	m	٠	4	55	190-	•	•	70	•	61		
•52	~	•	Š	56	59		•	62		56		•
.35	•	•	*	53	640-	-		56			•	
.45	7	•		37	04		•	***-		33		•
9	21	24		28	31		36	35		28	•	•
.75			*	34.	42			3	•	62	•	•
••	9	•	0	90	-00		•	11	•	-005	•	•
8.1	0	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	000	0000	0000	8	00.0	0	
))	
						LOWER	SURFACE					
	•	••	•	:	.01	Ş	69.	.71	.70		8	
0	N	64.	•	.79	.63	•0•	•	.92	-	100	7.	
0	Ç	•	.16	•35	*	.53	.57	.57	. 50	.42	. 20	60
0	ċ	•		900-	•01	•	•12	.12	3	*0*	- 10	2
~ •	5	•		23	20		•	10	13	20	•	•
~	ů	•	Ç	24	24	•	•	-11	21	24		•
N	Š	•	Ç	31	31	•	•	29	20	31		3
N		•		2	29		•	27	32	35		•
m	*	•		28	28	•	•	25	31	31	•	
•	~	•	?	26	26	•	•	23	26	23		•
•	?	•	7	13	21	•	•	17	17	21		•
	7	•	7	11	14	•	•	11	11	-110	•	17
	400	02	02	32	3	100	05	05	02	02	04	•
•	•	•	၁	0000	000	•	•	0.0	8.0	00.0	•	0.0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN MO	22	K = .0754	DEL	DELT AA = 4.03	4.03	MEAN AA	MEAN AA20			
×,	-019	-1.24	-2.21	-3.04	-3.68	6004-	-4.22	60.4-	-3.69	-3.05	-2.21	-1.24
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
00		.81	•	14.	•28	•1•	•07	30.	.21	-36	.87	47.
•01	• 60		.87	.93	06.	.97	16,	06.	.97			
•05	9	-	3	• 52	•59	•62	.70	990	.62	66.	1	
0	*	24	7	•11	•15	.24	.27	•1•		. 12	•	
-	7	7	~	700	60.	•13	•13	. 13	.13	*00	3	71-
~	Ç	0	0	•	•13	•22	.18	•22	-15	-112	•	200
•50	3		30	17	14		-00	-00	•	17	20	
N	1	3		24	22		16	19			27	*
M	Ç	ů.	7	27	21	•	47.	17		17	20	
	ě.	7		19	16		12	12	•	-110	•1 -	- 2
•	7	7	7	18	14		11	14		***	- 1	-11
•	6	*	•	オ・	30	•	***	26			45	-
ç	•	?	•	05	05		65	0		07	05	-
0	•	9	•	0000	0000	0.0	00.0	00.0	800	0.00	8	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
8	u	.01	69.	. 47	•20	*1.	•01	•00	.21	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	. 57	7.0
.01	.36	•05	27		95	-1.14	-1.26	-1.20	-1.01		3	112
•05	7	*	•	-1.05	~	-1.42	-1.49	-1.49	-1.42	-1.16	2	-
00	*	•	-	96*-	-1.10	_	-1.29	_	-	-1.07	*	
01.	*	~	•	91	~	~	-1.06	~		95	65	•
• T >	ů		•	0	93	67	93	93	7	77	70	3
•20	ů	9	•	77	000	0	0	13	00	77	3:	100-
57.	ů.		•	71	74	74	7	::-	71	65	63	57
•35	* (Š	•	54	09	63	63	3.	0.	50	51	•••
	Ų.	4	•	7.		51	51	51	3	45		30
000	7	7	•	24	32	32	32	32	32	20		21
•75	7	7	•	20	23	20	23	23	20	20	17	•1•-
•	0	0	10	01	01	*0	07	07	07	•00-	•0•-	07
8	•	0	•	0000	0.0	0000	8.0	00.0	0000	0.00	8.0	8.0

INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	23	K -0-1011	DELT	DELT AA .	*0	MEAN AA	20			
AA x / 2	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.0	8	00.0	00.0	8	00.0	00.0	8	8
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	1.00	1.05	0	1.00	.93	:		•	•		1.62	, 00
•01	0	•	•	•23	05	25	32	32	25			
•05	.23	0	.2	7.	70	:	16	•••	•	70		- 23
•0	21	•	3	***	00		92	•••	:	0	2.5	3
•10	07	7		39	47	57	57	57	57			
~	•	0	•	11	14	24	21	21	-110	•1•-	- 11	0
•20	30		45	52	50	19	**	100-	10	55	•	
•25	27	.3	•	42		-	**	•••			~	
.35	24	.3		37	37		43	37	0	3 7	0	- 23
.45	23			30	33	30	33	- , 30	30	30		
•	11	7	7	-1.	10		10	- 1	• 7 • -	•		0
-	10			22	22	22	22	10	-110	22	- 11	-
٠	900	Ç	3	.03	•03	.03	.03	.03	60.	6	0	•
0	0000	0000	•	00.0	00.0	0.00	00.0	8.0	00.0	0000		00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	1.00	1.05	0	1.00	.93	98.	3	5	3	•	1.00	
•01			.7.		.92	1.01	1.01	1.01	1001			1
-05	<u>_</u>	0	~	÷	.57	.68	.72	.72	3	-	\$	
• 0 •	*	~	7	•	•12	•19	.23	.23	•	•15	0	- 13
•10	*	1	~	13	03	03	-05	-05	8.0	03	15	~ .
• 15				11	•0•-	01	.01	01	•0•-	•0•-	11	12
010	3			15	15	09	600-	•0•-	60	15	22	25
•25	m (ry I	7	9(16	-110	10	07	10	10	21	27
• 35	7	7	7	13	13	10	- 10	07	13	13	13	22
• 45	7	7	7	10	-10	-10	07	07	100-	-10	13	13
09.	0	0	0	0000	0000	05	02	00.0	•0•-	•0•-	03	•0•-
5	2	2	7	90.	90•	•	•	•0•	•0•	•0•	•	0.
•	7	•	9	00	•		•0•	.11	.11	11.	. 11	•
>	Ò	•	•	00.0	8	000	0000	8	00.0	00.0	8.0	00.0

ENTS
COEFFICE
SSURE CO
S PRES
ITAMEOU
TAN

				INSTAN	INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	ME SSUR	E COEFFIC	JENTS				
		RUN NO	23	K =0.1011		SELT AA .	*0*	MEAN AA	20			
y, x	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.00	00.0	8	00.00	00.0	00.0	0
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	0	1.00	99.	19.	14.	•	.24	6	.31	. 6.	190	•
•01	-	•	16.	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.03	1.06	1.06	0
•05	01	•19	. 41	•55	99•	•		0	.77	• 70	66.	
0		21	90 • -	-12	•1•	.27	• 30	• 30	.30	• 1 •	60	
• 10		•	•05	90•	.17	• 20	.24	•5•	.20	.17	•	Ċ
~	o	.08	.12	.16	.22	.25	.29	.25	25	. 25		5
M		•	•	14	90	08	05	-00	80	80	- 17	-
N (•	•	16	13	07	40	07	-10	07	16	- 2
m.	7	•	•	11	90	08	05	05	00-	05		2
•	~	16	16	09	12	09	02	05	02	600-	09	
•	0	•	•	* 0•-	*0*-	01	01	• 25	01	01	100-	0
-	Ť	•	•	14	14	22	-•10	10	-10	10	• 1 • -	-
•	0		•	•0•	•03	90.	•0•	•0•	•0•	•0•	60.	ŏ
0	Õ	0.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	0,00	00.0	0.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	0	0	98.	19.	14.	.31	2.24	477		8		
0	Ş	.3	•	04	74	95	-1.08	-1.08		71	9	-
-05	9		53	79	-1.04	-1.23	-1.34	-1.34	'	-1.05	79	
۰ ۵	7	4	•	65	-1.03	-1.07	-1.14	-1.11	,	92	10	•
٠,		ů.	•	78	85	16	91	95		75	69	5.
- (3	*	•	09	19	74	74	76		64	54	**
N	Ď,	4	•	57	67	67	64	64		57	54	
N	m 1	m .	•	54	7.60	57	57	57		52	64	4.
m.	7	•	•	43	43	46	94	94		37	34	
•	7	7	•	29	35	32	32	32		29	26	2
.	7	7	•	17	17	21	17	17		13	10	0
	0	•	•	02	05	02	02	05		00.0	00.00	•
06.	90.	80.	90.	90.	90•	90.	•0•	•0•	.11	•0•	. 11	-
•	0	0	00.00	0000	00.0	••	0.00	8		00.0	0.00	0.0

INSTANTABEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTANI	INSTANTAMEDUS PI	PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	54	K =0.1299	DELT	DELT AA =	4.05	MEAN AA	* -•20			
*	0000	0000	00•0	00.0	0000	00.0	00.00	00.0	0.00	00.0	00.00	00.0
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
•	1.02	1.07	1.09	1.02	-97	.93	88	88	90	.97	1.05	1.09
•01	.90	04.	.43	•20	-00	22	29	39	25	09	.14	040
•05	•23	01	23	63	73	81	91	91	88	73	52	27
•02	-115	37	58	77	83	95	92	92	89	80	77	58
•10	07	22	32	4J	50	54	57	57	57	54	47	32
•15	80	†0°-	+00-	-18	38	24	24	24	18	21	14	14
•50	30	-,39	-,52	55	64	49	199-	64	61	55	52	42
•52	27	39	39	42	48	53	48	48	48	48	45	36
•35	24	-•30	33	04	43	04.	43	43	43	37	37	33
•45	19	26	-+30	37	-•30	-,33	33	-•30	33	-•30	30	23
•	08	11	18	18	18	18	-•18	14	18	14	14	11
•75	18	22	22	-•26	26	26	26	26	26	26	22	18
•	•03	•03	00.0	0000	02	•03	•03	00.00	-• 05	00.0	00.0	90.
1.00	00.0	000	0000	00.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	00.0	0.00
						LOWER	SURFACE					
8	1.02	1.07	1.09	1.02	.97	.93	.88	.88	• 90	.97	1.05	1.09
.01	.33	•55	•76	.92	96.	1.01	1.04	1.04	1.01	96.	.92	.79
•05	16	•09	.31	•53	•61	•72	•76	•76	•68	•65	• 50	•39
•02	040-	25	-10	40.	•15	•23	•27	.27	•23	•15	40.	02
01.	4.1	29	20	07	00.0	000	•05	• 02	• 02	03	10	20
•15	31	24	18	08	+00-	•	•01	• 01	•01	+00-	11	18
• 20	38	28	22	15	12	-•09	90	90 •-	-°08	12	19	22
• 52	32	27	21	16	13	-,10	07	07	-,13	13	-,21	21
•35	25	19	16	-10	-10	07	+0°-	07	10	13	13	19
• 45	13	10	10	07	07	00.0	00.0	04	07	07	07	13
090	900	0000	00.0	0000	00.0	000	•0•	0.00	0.00	0.00	02	90
5	90.	:	80.	90.	11:	80.	11.	11:	90.	90.	• 08	90.
06.	*	•14		11.	•11	•14	•17	•14	•11	•14	•11	•11
7	000	00.0	0000	00.0	00.00	00.00	00.00	00.00	00.00	00.0	00.00	00.00

				INSTANT	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	E COEFFIC	CIENTS				
		RUN NO	54	K =0.1299	DELT	AA =	4.05	MEAN AA	A =20			
×/c	0000	0000	0000	00•0	00•0	0000	00.0	00.00	00 • 0	00.00	00.00	0.0
						UPPER	SURFACE					
•	1.07	1.02	80	12.5	3		;					
•01	69		0.0		600	• 20	•31	• 28	•36	• 50	69*	88
200				14.		1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	. 07		
	00.	• 10	• 34	•		.73	.73	.73	7.3		9	
	0	24	600-	•05		.18	24	200		2	• 52	44.
01.	25	11	07	•05		220	120	•	17.	•21	•00	06
•15	01	•05	• 05	21.5			07.	07.	11.	•17	•00	00.0
•20	39	30	27	410-		0 0	629	• 25	• 18	•25	•15	.08
•25	36	-130	01.1	11.		00.	80	-•08	08	11	17	- 23
•35	27	100	117	070		-10	07	07	10	13	- 10	70
545	-23	- 22		***		-08	08	11	14	11	- 17	17.
9		000	910	12		12	05	09	12	71-	71	
7.5			***	*0		01	01	01	10.1	40.1	910	71.
		770-	-14	14		14	14	41	8		•	80.
		•03	•0	90•	•0	90•	90.	90	910	* 1 0	97.	-18
	0000	•	00.0	00.0		000				•	• 03	•03
							90.0	00.0	00.00	00.0	0.00	000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	1.07	1.02	. 88	.7.1		96	;	;				
•01	•58	•30	03	37	494-	900	100	87.		• 50	69•	.88
•05	•13	16	46					200		67	37	03
•09	25	43	62				67.1	-1.63		-1.01	79	46
919	36	46	59			6 6 6	1001-	-1.03		92	77	58
•15	27	41	50			700	0 1	65	85	75	-,69	56
•50	31	38	48			100	100	190-	64	09	54	744-
•52	32	38	46				100	100-	57	57	51	440-
•35	28	28	34			76.	***	52	52	64	49	43
• 45	16	26	-,23				0	31	04.	37	34	28
090	900-	900-	-10			925	62.	29	-,26	23	19	61.
52.	•03	•03	00.0				61.	13	13	10	-10	-00
•90	90•	•11	•111			60.	•03	00.0	•03	•03	•03	90
80	0000	00.0	00.0			18	*10	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•14	•11	•11	
		•	•			00.0	00.0	000	000	0000	00.00	0000

_
S
-
Z
ш
=
4.4
\simeq
W
OEFF
Ũ
_
ш
≂
=
-2
.,
S
RES
Œ
•
M
=
×
v
~
3
⋖
-
Z
2
_
5
=

				INS	TANT	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	RESSURE	COEFFICIENTS	:IENTS				
		RUN NO	25	K * •1	.1588	DELT	¥	4.06	MEAN AA	20			
× ×	20	•	1.82	2.67	7.	3.31	3.72	3.85	3.72	3.31	2.67	1.83	•85
							UPPER	SURFACE					
8	1.00	1.05		1 • 0	9	•95	• 90	• 86	99	.93	.97	1.02	1.07
•01	•	•73	•	•2	0	05	•	N	•	~	Ç) K
•05	•05	16	45	99	•	86	-1.06	-1.09	-1.02	95		- 653	190
•05	7	34		L •-	1	80	•	0		00	4	9	1
•10	7	18		**	e e	144-	•		•	10	4) (7 1
57.	0	01	0		4	21	•	N	24	N	7	800-	
•20	Ģ	36	•		2	58	•	ø		-	3	•) (
•25	6	33		4	ñ	45	•	4		5	4	. (4)	٦.
•35		-•30	•	3	17	04	•	•	•	E	6	1	10
• 45	7	23	•	-93	5	33	•	6	•	CI	7	2	
09.	7	11	•	T • -	40	18	•	-	-,14		7	0	0
.75	7	10	•	2	8	30	•	N	•	N	-		-
•	9	•03	•	0.0	0	00.0	•	0	•03	0	0		60.
1.00	0.00	0000		0.0	0	00.00	•	0	00.00	0	Õ	. 0) C
										•))
							LOWER	SURFACE					
0	0	1.05		1.0	2	•95	06.	€0	• 86	.93	0	Q	1-07
10.	7	•	•	₩.	9	•95	9	.98	• 98	8/.	• 95	2	•
200	3	0	• 5	•	Ņ.	•57	•	9	•68	•65	5	4	•31
000	*	N	7	•	=	• 08	7	~	•19	•12	0	0	-10
9:	*	Ň (?		m.	07	•	0	•	07	7	16	23
i.		N		1	4	08	0	0		+0	7	18	24
• 20		N		1	o,	15	٦.	7	•	-,15		N	28
•25	38	N	21	18	œ '	16	16	13	13	16	21	24	27
635	7	N	7	7	•	13	7	-	•	16	7	~	25
	7	┛,	•	7:	m ·	07		7		10		-	16
9 1	7	0	ŏ	0	9	-•06	0	0	•	90° -	7	~	90
• 15	0	0		•	9	90•	0	0	•	90•	0	0	•03
•	7	-	7	•	8	•11	0	•	•		-	0	•11
3	3	•		0	9	00.00	0	000		00.00	Ō	0	0000

				INSTAN	ITANEOUS	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	25	K = .1588		DELT AA =	\$0°	MEAN AA	1 =20			
AA X/C	19	-1.24	-2.22	-3.07	-3.71	-4.12	-4.25	-4.12	-3.71	-3.07	-2.23	-1.25
						UPPER	SURFACE					
000	0	0	0	*L*	•	_ (n)	•31	•28	m	.50	•	00
•	-		Ō	1.03	0	0	16.	• 93	C	1.00	497	0 (
•05	16	•16	• 26	.41	.52	•55	.55	.52	.52	84.	930	116
•05	m	7	0	•12	~	~	•24	•27	~	•15	00.0	•
•10	7	0	Ō	•13	~	.17	•20	•20	_	.13	0	9
•15	0	0	~	•18	2	2	•25	•25	~	•15	-	9
•20	7	7	7	11	~	0	08	•	_	11	~	2
•25	2	~	~	13	0	07	07	-•10	~	16	24	N
.35	7	7	7	08	0	0	08		~	111	2	2
.45		7	7	60	0	0	09	•		12		2
9	0	0	•	+00-	•05	•	01	•	0	+00-	0	
• 75	7	7	7	10	10	7	14		_	18	_	2
•	ė,	0	0	60•	9	0	•0•	•	0	•00	0	9
0001	0	0	0	00.0	0000	0	00.0	00.00	0	00.0	00.0	00.0
							20429					
8	1.05	1.00	0		• 55	•36	.31	•28	•36	-50	195	
-01	•	•30	0.00	27	61	86	98	98	69	67	43	12
•05	•	23	*	•	-•90	-1.16	-1.20	-		•	75	
••	•	47	• 5	•	92	-1.03	~	•	-1.03	•	81	•
•10	*	49	•	•	78	85	91	91	85	78	69	62
670	•	7	S	•	57	70	***	•	64	•	54	
07.	•	\$	'n	•	57	61	67	•	64	•	54	
670		100	•	•	1.54	54	57	•	52	•	64	
}	•	46.	•	•				•	43	•	34	•
	•	620-	?	•	32	39	39	•	•	•	23	•
? ;	•		7 (•	170-	17	17	•	13	•	10	•
:	•	00.0	9	0	.00	05	05	•	•	•03	00.0	•00
2	•		9	•	0	•	•1•	•	•	•	•0	•0•
•	3	3	•	•	8	000	000	8	0	000	0.00	0.00

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSURE	E COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	56	K = .1909		DELT AA =	4.08	MEAN AA	=20			
,	20	• 85	1.83	2.68	3.33	3.74	3.87	3.74	3,33	2.68	1.84	.85
) X						UPPER	SURFACE					
8	9	90	90		8	.78	•76	.78	.81	06.	• 95	•95
33			000		- 05	-122	-,32	25	-,19	02	• 20	240
5.5	0 0		9		77	- 95	66-	-1.02	91	73	55	34
700		200	7.7		260	- 692	-1001	95	92	89	74	58
	-18	- 36	- 50	- 50	15-	61	68	-,64	61	54	14	36
•15							,	ŕ	63	17.	4	04
•20	36	52	58		64	190-	190-	2:	0	100		
.25	45	51	53		56	59	62	-653	-653	53	16.	740-
35	33	46	640-	940-	53	640-	640-	64.	940	64.	97	1000
645	050-	040-	1101		04.1	***	110	•	•			
090	-224	31	31		28	31	31	31	28	24	21	-•21
7.0	- 22	46	45-		34	34	34	38	30	26	26	30
	100	80	800-		80	08	-008	08	05	02	02	05
	0000	0000	0000		0000	0000	0000	00.00	0000	0000	0000	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	060	.95			88	.78	.76	• 78	.81	06.	• 95	• 95
2	227	640			.92	.95	•95	86.	• 95	689	.83	• 64
00	-220	•05			•53	.57	•61	•61	•53	• 50	•31	•16
900	- 40	25			•08	•12	•12	•12	•0	• 0 •	900-	670-
10	46	36			13	10	100-	07	16	16	23	39
15	140-	-034			14	14	14	14	-•21	18	27	160-
	1.5.1	44-			28	28	28	28	-,31	35	41	1.48
200	200	-632			21	21	21	24	24	27	32	38
3	- 228	-025			16	-,19	16	-•19	-•19	25	28	34
4	-016	13			-•10	-•10	10	-•10	13	13	16	23
90	900-	900-			900-	90	900-	90	13	-•10	-•10	170-
-75	02	02		00.0	00.00	05	05	05	08	-05	-00	11
0	0000	03			•03	00.0	00.0	00.00	00.0	0000	0000	0000
00.	0000	0.00	00.0		00.0	00.00	0000	00.0	000	00.00	00.0	00.00

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	PRESSUR	E COEFFIC	: IENTS				
		RUN NO	\$ 2	K = .1909		DELT AA =	4.08	MEAN AA	1 =20			
**	19	-1.25	-2.23	-3.08	-3.73	-4.14	-4.27	-4.14	-3.73	-3.08	-2.24	-1.25
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	.93	•86	•76	•59	•43	•31	•17	•26	•36	• 45	.67	.61
•01	•63	•80	•93	• 93	-97	1.00	1.00	1.00	.93	• 93	• 93	• 90
•05	16	•05	•26	.37	.48	.55	.55	.55	•55	.48	637	•23
•05	43	27	12	00.0	•00	• 18	•18	•15	•12	600	06	18
•10	29	18	11	00.0	90•	•13	•13	•00	600	•05	+00-	15
.15	-130	- 33	-130	-220	17	41	41	41	17	23	1 30	-136
200	64.1	46		700	170	1	100	170	1	1000		000
670	7401	000	06	470-	770-	67.	770-	910	770-	\$7.ª	06	33
.35	33	-030	-•30	24	17	17	27	21	24	27	27	33
• 45	30	23	26	23	19	-•19	-•16	23	23	23	26	-•30
	18	21	18	14	18	14	11	11	18	21	18	24
•75	18	26	22	18	22	22	18	22	22	26	26	26
060	02	-05	05	05	-•02	0000	00.0	02	05	05	-•05	08
1.00	0000	00.0	0000	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.0	00.00	00.00	00.0	00.0	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	.93		.76	•59	.43	•31	.17	•26	•36	645	.67	.81
•01	.42		15	46	190-	89	-2.46	95	80	61	-•30	•05
•05	08		09*-	86	-1.05	-1.20	-5.83	-1.23	-1,12	97	68	940-
•02	-040-		73	88	-1.03	-1.11	-8.51	-1.11	-1.03	92	81	58
•10	64.		72	82	88	91	3.12	95	85	-85	72	62
•15	140-		190-	70	+1	77	1,66	77	-°74	01	60	L+0-
•50	57		70	-°74	77	80	-,31	80	77	7.	64	57
•25	940-		57	090-	63	09	63	09*-	57	57	52	43
•35	37		48	94.	48	46	1.48	1.48	940-	43	04.	34
.45	26		32	29	32	29	32	32	29	29	23	16
9	17		21	17	21	21	17	17	13	13	10	10
•75	05	11	11	11	-111	08	08	08	05	-05	02	02
06.	05		02	0000	-•05	0000	0000	-•05	00.0	0000	00.0	•03
1.00	0000		0000	0000	00.00	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	0000

				INSTANI	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	E COEFFIC	:IENTS				
		RUN NO	7.2	K = .2278	DELT	DELT AA =	4.10	MEAN AA	=20			
	20	•86	1.84	5.69	3,35	3.76	3.89	3.76	3,35	2.69	1.85	• 86
×/×						UPPER	SURFACE					
6	0	107			88	.81	+ L.	.76	.81	•86	.93	• 95
3					200	604-	19	25	-,15	02	• 23	647
500		000			73	88	-1,13	66	88	84	55	45
200	2 "	25.0			92	98	-1.04	-1.04	-1,11	86	83	67
100	18	22	36	39	50	54	57	54	54	54	50	29
•15	:	30			5.58	-,58	-,64	61	61	58	640-	45
070	110-	600		7. d	44	2	5.5	- 53	51	48	45	39
629	- 30	1.034			4	43	940-	- 46	- 43	040-	30	30
632	000	1601			080-	33	37	37	37	30	26	26
	07.	100			12.2	-22	24	28	21	21	18	14
0	910	***			1.22	-1.22	-126	26	22	18	14	18
	970-	- 20			270-	-002	02	02	00.00	0000	00.0	•03
000	0000	0000		00.0	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	0000
							ν,					
						LOWER	SURFACE					
8	0				60	8	.74°	.76	.81	• 86	.93	• 95
					.92	.89	•92	•92	•92	•89	.83	• 10
100	-23				• 50	•57	•53	.57	•53	94.	•31	•20
505	51				40.	.12	•12	•12	*0°	•01	06	21
10	52				13	13	13	13	16	23	29	36
15	47				18	14	18	18	21	21	27	37
200	57				35	35	35	38	38	41	440-	51
25	- 43				24	21	21	24	27	32	35	41
35	31				22	22	22	25	28	28	31	37
5	-016				10	13	13	13	19	-19	23	620-
90	-13				10	13	02	13	13	17	13	170-
22	05				02	02	05	-08	11	11	11	11
060	0000	00.00	00.0	00.0	02	0000	-202	-02	40.0	200	200	700
1.00	0000				00.00	000	000	00.00	00.00	0000	•	•

		25 -1.26						200								0000											70 - 70								
		-3.10 -2.25		٠				900								0.00											777								
	AA =20	-3,75		33	1,03	44	40	13	;	-111	-•16	14	-00	08	14	•00	00.00	•			. 23		-1-16	-1.07	88	74	77	57	46	- 29	1	100	-000	000	0
ICIENTS	MEAN AA	-4.16		• 26	1.03	9	000	•17	,	-000	13	-•08	-•09	08	14	•03	00.00				76	100	-1.23	-1-11	91	74	- 80	60	84.	-229	21	100	000	0000	00.0
INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	4.10	-4.29	SURFACE	•26	1.06	552	600	•17	•	000	13	08	12	-•11	14	•03	00.0			SURFACE	724	- 92	-1.23	-1.11	95	77	83	63	51	32	21		110	•03	0000
S PRESSU	DELT AA =	-4.15	UPPER	•36	1.06	.52	600	.17	0	•	-•13	-•11	-00	08	05	•03	0000			LOWER	36	- 83	-1.20	-1.03	889	80	80	63	51	32	21	-		0000	00*0
ANTANEOU		-3.75		.45	1.06	.48	•05	1.16	1		910-	*I •-	-00	-•11	-•10	•03	00.00				.45	61	-1.01	99	88	74	80	65	48	35	21	-		700	0000
INST	K = .2278	-3.09						•0•	717-		-17	*T	16	-•111	-•10	•03	0000				•64	34	75	85	78	64	77	09*-	51	35	21	14	200	200	0000
	27	-2.24		• 86												•00					.86	-006	57	70	69	64	70	60	46	32	24	14	02		2000
	RUN NO	-1.26		06.												•03											1.64								
		-•19		.93												0000											61								
		¥××		0	.01	•05	•05	•10	•15	25	36	1			0.0	9	1.00				00	00	•05	002	•10	•15	• 50	• 52	932		090	•75	06	000	

				INSTANT	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE CREFFICIENTS	RESSURE	COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	28 K	K = .2695	DELT	DELT AA =	4.12	MEAN AA	a20			
	20	980	1.85	2.71	3.36	3.77	3.91	3.77	3,36	2.71	1.86	• 86
2						UPPER	SURFACE					
								;	70	a	00	. 93
6	9	90	665	.93	• 90	.83	.83	.81	000	•		5.7
3			4	117		600-	15	-00	700-	07.		
5				70		-1.09	-1.09	-1.36	95	81	63	1.40
05	19	C++2	000			1 20	-1.38	-1.29	-1.29	-1.17	-1.11	92
90	77	980	-1.14	-1.62		1707	12	173	64	61	54	43
10	36	50	54	61		71.	710-		•			
15					9	17	19	58	55	52	45	39
50	45	640-		- 20	2 .	1		4.48	48	42	39	39
25	42	1.45		51	16	16.	1001			33	33	24
35	- 33	37		43	04.	1.40	3/			0	717	16
	100			33	33	33	30	97	000		9 0	71
	000		1.28	- 28	24	24	18	18	18	01.		***
	94.0	9.0		8	81.1	-,14	18	14	14	-14	\$T.	*1.
• 15	979-	07*-				70	900	•00	90•	•0•	0000	90.
06	0000	02					0000	00.00	00.00	0000	0000	0000
8	0000	0000		000	000							
						LOWIN	SUKLACE					
					ć	0	a	18.	.86	.88	• 90	• 93
8	• 90				06.	000	9	90	90	.89	• 79	.67
01	.18				. 89	66.			14	200	.31	•16
•02	27				94.	100	10.		12	02	06	25
-05	51				00	• 12	· 15	77.		23	- 33	39
10	52				16	13	10	-15	1	76	- 41	1.50
	45				27	27	27	570-	17.	100	75	- 661
100	1			•	41	38	- 38	140-	1	1		1
9 0					24	24	24	24	27	76	000	1
679					-,25	25	22	25	-,28	34	1,40	240
.35	1001				13	13	10	16	13	23	07.	70
•	67.				10	90	90	13	13	11	1100	170-
9	13					100	-105	08	-,11	11	-, 14	11
•75	-00	05	- 605	700-			200	02	02	+00-	40	07
90	6.21				700-			0	00.00	00.0	00.00	0000
000	0000				00.00	0000	200	}	•			

				INST	ANTANEOU	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	E COEFF10	IENTS				
		RUN NO	88	K = .2695		DELT AA =	4.12	MEAN AA	20			
<	19	-1.26	-2.25	-3.11	-3.76	-4.17	-4.31	-4.18	-3.76	-3.11	-2,26	-1.26
) X						UPPER	SURFACE					
;		6	5				31	•26	•33	.43	.57	•76
8	67.	000	1000				1.06	1.06	1.00	1.03	1.00	.97
	41.	1001	119				.41	.37	16.	•26	• 16	•05
200	1010	1 4	04-				21	21	30	04	64	64
010	-36	- 25	-15	07	0000	0.00	11	00.0	+00-	15	18	25
.15		ć	:				41.	41	17	20	27	33
• 50	33	-•53	1						22	70.7	08.1	75
•25	33	27	22			13	-13		77.	17.	900	100
.35	17	17	-,11				11	11	11.	110-	57.	170
45	19	12	-00				-00	-,16	19	23	26	- 30
9	18	11	11				11	14	14	18	24	21
7	10	10	05				18	18	18	-•18	22	26
	60	90.	90.	90•	•00	•00	•00	00.0	00.00	•03	00.00	000
000	0000	0000	00.0				00.0	00.00	00.00	0000	00.00	000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
5	0							•26	.33	•43	.57	•76
200	44				1.50			92	83	67	04	09
05	-01	•						-1,23	-1.12	-1.01	79	53
505	36	' '			99			-1.07	-1.03	96*-	88	70
10	52	i						95	91	85	75	62
• 15	1.57	1-67	-•70	17		83	87	06 •-	87	83	10	67
•20	67	Ĭ						86	86	83	80	2.
.25	64.	ĭ						63	09*-	57	54	64.
.35	46	ĭ						54	51	51	46	04
645	29	ĭ						29	29	-•29	26	-•23
909	24	ĭ						21	-•21	17	21	-13
.75	14	ĭ						11	11	08	08	-00
06.	07	ĭ						-•05	-•05	0.00	02	05
1.00	00.00	ŏ						00.00	00.00	0.00	00.00	0.00

ASTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

-1.08 -1.44 -1.79 -1.11 -1.05 -1.57 -1.84 -1.06 -1.13 -1.60 -82 -88 -65 -66 -66 -63 -66 -66 -63 -66 -66 -63 -60 -65 -63 -60 -65 -63 -60 -65 -63 -60 -65 -63 -60 -65	-1.08 -1.11 -1.11 -1.84 -1.05 -1.60 -1.62 -1.63 -1.65
,	
000000000000000000000000000000000000000	331710 261707 352415 212219 272121 150804 090609 0.00 0.00 0.00

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	6	K = .0318		DELT AA =	6.02	MEAN AA	MEAN AA =20			
AA A/Y	19	-1.75	-3.20	-4.45	-5.41	-6.01	-6.21	-6.01	-5.41	-4.45	-3.21	-1.76
, i						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	••	.71		30*-	51	65	+6*-	85	•	0	•	.76
.01	• 2 •	3	.77	•	•63	.58	•53	.53	9	9	. 73	-82
•05	0	.27	3	1.20	1.20	. 88		.88			• •	7
•0•	•	•	~	•58	649	*1.	.53	.53		3	-	07
•10	•	24	0	-01	.35	• 35	.21	•21	~	0	00.0	-14
•15	0	•	7	•	•25	.31	•35	•31	N	•25	. ~	96
• 20	?	•	~	•	90	•00	•05	•	0		~	28
•52	?	•	?	•	12	100-	01	•	0	~	~	- 30
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	34	~	15	15	08	00		7		N	27
•••	-	•	7	•	16	09	12		7	_	. ~	23
0	~	•		•	17	14	14		7	N	N	-020
. 75	7	•	7	•	15	-115	08		7		-	-15
•	0	•	0	•	05	05	05		9	C		
1.00	•	•	•	•	8000	0000	00.0	000	0	000	000	0
						LOVER	SURFACE					
•••		.71	•	-00	51	15	46.5	•	-		0	76
10.	A	•	•	-	-2.01	-2.41	N	•	~	4	77	0 0
-05	~	•	7	~	-2.09	-2.40	N		2	1.6	-	195-
•0•	Ş	•	1:1	-1.42	-1.60	-1.72	~			-1.35	-1.09	72
04.	•	•	•	_	-1.26	-1.33	-1.36		7	1.1	16	3
•15	÷	•	•	89	-1.02	-1.05	~			89	76	59
070	*	•	•	74	:	***	06	•		99	61	49
2	•	•		73	***	67	07		•	73	65	51
66.		•	S		67	70	70			61	52	43
Ŷ	?	•	•	50	54	0	54	•	•	50	***-	37
0	7	•	~	22	33	33	30	•	•	22	22	19
. 73	7	•	7	17	-•20	20	20	•		14	14	60
	03	8	0.00	0.0	03	03	00.0	03	000	00.0	00.00	-02
8	3	•	,	0000	8	0.00	000	•		0000	8	0000

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	AMEOUS	PRESSURI	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	20	K = .0494	DELT	DELT AA =	60.03	MEAN AA =	20			
¥	20	1.36	2.81	4.06	5.02	5.62	5.82	5.62	5.02	4.06	2.81	1.36
X/X						UPPER	SURFACE					
5	90		88		**	-27	•18	•25	945	.71	• 90	1.00
3	. 4				-1.94	-2.53	-2.67	-2.58	-2014	-1.60	77	0
05	-20		61		-1,36	-1.65	-1.72	-1.65	-1047	-1.19	72	26
900	23		80		-1.35	-1.47	-1.54	-1.47	-1.41	-1.20	99	30
010	21		56		95	-1.02	-1.06	-1.06	99	88	67	640-
15	•12		-004		14	20	20	-•20	17	14	07	•05
20	- 35		60		79	82	85	82	82	73	090-	- 50
.25	36		53		+90-	70	70	70	67	64	56	440-
35	31		040-		53	090-	56	56	090-	09	-047	040
45	26		33		43	43	140-	47	740-	43	-•36	-,33
090	20		27		34	04	34	34	37	30	-•30	24
•75	15		15		18	22	22	-, 18	22	18	18	15
06*	-005		02		02	05	02	0000	05	000	05	0
1.00	000	0000	00.00	00.0	00.0	000	00.0	000	0000	0000	0000	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
•	90		8		44.	227	•18	•25	•45	•71	• 90	1.00
	36	•	686		96	98	86.	1.01	96	86.	• 89	.70
200	-014		64.	.73	.81	.93	.93	.93	• 85	69.	.45	•21
000	42	•	•01		•39	.46	94.	• 46	.35	•24	.01	16
•10	94.	•	16		•13	•16	•25	•13	90•	0000	16	32
•15	- 643	i	20		00.0	•08	•08	• 08	00.0	07	20	- 30
•20	36	·	14		•01	•05	•08	• 05	01	-00	17	26
•25	37	i	24		07	+00-	+00-	-00¢	12	18	26	-
.35	34	i	22		10	100-	05	07	-10	16	-•22	200
645	31	i	18		80	-08	08	08	15	18	\$7°-	70-
09*	08	ĭ	400-		•05	•05	•05	•05	1.04	100	08	0
.75	-006	Ī	03		-•03	0000	•05	0000	-•03	06	900-	00
06*	0.0	•	•02		•0	•01	•07	40.	•05	•05	•05	00
1.00	0000	ŏ	0000		0000	00.00	000	• 00	0.00	0000	00 00	•

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	20	K = .0494	DEL	DELT AA =	6.03	MEAN AA	1 =20			
AA,	-•19	-1.75	-3,21	94.4-	-5.42	-6.02	-6.22	-6.02	-5.42	-4.46	-3.21	-1.76
X						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	• 90	•73	.37	05	49	77	92	80	51	05	.37	.73
10	84.	.73	.87	•82	.77	.68	•63	•63	.73	•82	.87	•82
•05	•00	.34	.63	•81	88	.91	•95	• 95	.91	88	• 10	•52
500	7	07	•16	•34	643	.53	•56	• 56	640	040	•25	40.
•10	31	17	0000	•14	•21	•21	•28	•28	• 28	•17	·07	07
•15	•08	•12	•21	•28	•31	•31	• 38	• 38	.35	• 28	•25	• 18
•20		28	19	90*-	0000	0000	•05	• 06	• 02	03	16	22
•25	36	27	21	-•12	07	+00-	-•01	•01	01	100-	-•18	24
.35		24	21	05	08	05	05	-•05	-•02	08	15	24
649		23	16	-•12	-•09	06	09	-00	09	600-	16	23
090	7	20	17	-•10	10	10	07	-•10	-•10	10	17	17
•75	7	11	11	08	08	08	08	+00-	08	08	11	11
06.	0	05	0000	•03	00.0	00.0	00.0	•03	00.0	0000	0000	•03
1.00	•	000	000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	000	0000	000	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	060	.73	.37	-•05	49	77	92	80	51	05	.37	.73
•01	•27	25	80	-1.45	-1.98	-2,38	-2.54	-2.35	-1.98	-1.42	80	19
•05	26	69	-1017	-1.65	-2.05	-2,32	-2.48	-2,32	-2.05	-1.61	-1.17	65
•05	50	79	-1.09	-1.35	-1.61	-1.68	-1.72	-1.68	-1.61	-1.35	-1.09	76
•10	55	410-	94	-1.13	-1.16	-1.29	-1.33	-1.29	-1.16	-1.07	06 •-	12-
•15	940-	99	76	92	99	-1.05	-1.05	-1.02	92	82	76	59
•20	45	52	65	-•71	81	84	87	81	74	65	58	52
•25	46	59	65	73	82	82	87	82	76	04	59	54
•35	04.	640-	52	61	61	70	67	-•61	61	52	49	43
045	37	440-	440-	50	53	56	53	50	50	440-	040-	37
090	15	22	19	22	26	30	-•30	22	22	15	19	-,15
•75	11	14	14	14	17	20	17	14	14	-•09	14	-00
• 90	0000	0000	•05	00.0	0000	00.0	03	•05	• 05	•05	•05	•05
1.00	0000	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.00	0000	00.00	00.00	0000	00.0	000

ANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	TANEOUS	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	1	K = .0749	DELT	T AA =	90.9	MEAN AA	1 =20			
44 X / X	20	1.36	2.81	4.07	5.03	5.63	5.83	5.63	5.03	4.07	2.82	1.36
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	.92	.97	.92	•73	•	• 30	•20	~	642	797		9
0	9	•	.5	-	1.9	2.4	2.	2.6	2.3	7 - 7	•	200
0	7	.2	9.	-1.08	*	9	•	~	3	.2		- 51
0	7	ň	6	~	1.3	1.5	-	1.6	1.5	1.2	•	71
•10	24	64	67	88	-1.02	-1.09	-1.16	-1.16	-1.09			63
-	0	0	7	17	.2	.2	•	2	7	.2		07
N	6	Š	•	62	8	6.		•	80	7	•	57
V	7	ů.	9.1	1	~	~	79	~	1	9.	64	56
9		*	•	•	Φ	9	69	ø	9	9		47
	.	4	4	١	5	5	•	5	5	4		0
0 1	7		*	1	•	4	٠	4	*	4		37
~ (7	2	•	-•29	29	2		2	3	.2	•	22
,	9	7	7	11	0	7	08	0	0	7	•	-08
Ō	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	000	0	0	00.0	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00•	.92	16.	•	• 7	-	•30	•20	.23	.42	990	6	80
	7		.82		1.01	96.	96.	96.	86	86	0	70
0	Ņ	4	•	9.	•	• 93	.97	.93		-	-	29
)	•	7.	0	m.	m	• 42	.42	•42	3	N	0	09
4 -	•	9	7	0	\mathbf{c}	•13	•13	•16	•00	0	-	29
40		9 (7.	0.	0	000	• 05	• 05	0	0	~	23
	•	7	7 '	70-	Э.	•01	•02	01	•	0	-	23
V 1	ě (m (N	2	_	•	•	+0 •-	07	7	24	35
9 4	9	7	7	1.	~ ·	-10	10	07	7	7	~	31
t ·	7	Ž		-•1	┥.	•	•	11	7.	7	~	24
0 r	9	0	0	0	0	•	•	800	0	0	0	-00
- (9	9	?	0	a	0000	0000	•05	•	0	0	06
0	0	0	0	0	0	•	•		0	0	0	•05
)	õ	0	, T	0	0	00.00	000	0.0	0.00	0000	0	000

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENT

				INSTAN	TANEOUS	PRESSUR	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	51	K = .0749		DELT AA =	6.04	MEAN AA	1 =20	_		
AA X/C	19	-1.76	-3.21	94.4-	-5.42	-6.03	-6.23	-6.03	-5.43	14.47	-3.22	-1,76
						UPPER	SURFACE					
Õ	0	00	64.	00.0	6	73	85	77	S	-	~	.71
0	Ň	9	.73	•73	•	.58	.48	.43	9	1	-	.77
•05	80	•27	64.	99•	.77	1	. 68	. 88		.77	99•	.40
0	•	2	*0		3	.43	94.	64.	•	3	-	+0
-	•	• 2	_	00.0	_	•1•	.17	.17	~	0	0	14
~	0	ó	~	.15	2	.28	•28	•28	~	2	_	00
N	•	ū	•2	19	~	•		03	0	-	N	31
2	*	Ę.	•2	-•21		•	•	07	7	-	2	30
3	4	Ę.	6	-•21	_	•	•	111	7	-	N	31
4	4	ũ	.2	26	$\overline{}$	•	•	09	7	~	~	33
09.		~	•2	24	2		•	17	7	N	N	27
~	2	~	18	18	~	15	•	11	7	~		22
ç	•	ó	0	05	0	•		05	0	O	0	-005
1.00	0	ó	•	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
•					•		į			í		
> (•	0	•	Э,	i.	•		i	i		.27	.71
9 0	•	9		٠,	:		N	2	7	40	90	22
) (•	•	9 0	٠.	;.		ν.	i.	2.	3,	-1.21	73
0		100-	7	-1-10	1011	-1-24	2/01-	-1-67	11.00	W	-1.13	62.
~	~	5	1	•		1					**	
~				74	01	•	06 -		•	7		
~				73	79		07		•	~	- 59	
•	•			61	64		70		•		52	9
•	•	*	•	50	53	•	56		•	1	04	16
	~	~	~	22	26	•	30	•	•	7	15	11
-	•	~	-	•!•-	50	•	17	•		7.	09	09
•	0	0	0	*0*	03	•	• 05	•	•	•	.02	-05
0	0	0	Ō	000	0.0	00.0	00.0	8	8.	00.0		0.0

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSURI	E COEFFIC	ENTS				
		RUN NO	52	K = .1004	DELT	*	90.9	MEAN AA =	20			
*	-•20	1.36	2.82	4.08	5.04	5,65	5.85	5.65	5.04	4.08	2.83	1.36
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	885	•92	•92	.80		.35	•23	•23	•39	• 56	.80	.92
0	99	.29	29	-1,11		-2.24	-2.58	-2.53	-2.24	-1.75	-1.02	24
•05	-23	11	1.54	93		-1.54	-1.65	-1.65	-1.54	-1.26	86	51
.05	23	53	77	-1.11	-1.47	-1.47	-1.57	-1.57	-1.47	-1.29	-1.05	77
•10	24	38	56	74		99	-1.09	-1.06	95	88	74	53
.15	.12	•00	-004	10		14	17	20	-,14	14	07	-00¢
•20	35	440-	60	99•-	85	79	82	85	82	76	99*-	50
•25	33	41	50	59		67	67	67	64	62	53	140-
35	27	37	040-	4		-,53	56	56	53	50	47	37
645	23	30	33	-•36		43	43	47	04.	040	33	26
090	24	27	27	-•30		37	37	040-	34	34	27	27
.75	15	15	18	22		26	22	18	15	22	15	15
06°	.03	00.0	00.0	0000		•03	•03	•03	e03	•03	•03	•00
1.00	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	00.00	0000	000	0000	000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00.	.85		•92		•54	• 35	•23	•23	•39	• 56	.80	•92
•01	.14		.79		•92	.92	•89	.92	•92	•92	• 86	.73
.02	-634		•33		.73	.77	.77	.81	.77	•65	64.	•25
•05	61		09		•20	•31	•35	•31	•24	•13	-001	-16
•10	58		22		•03	•0	•00	• 00	• 03	03	16	32
•15	50		23		+00-	000	+00-	04	+00-	10	20	- 33
•20	640-		20		+00-	40.	+00-	+00-	07	17	-•20	29
•25	949		29		15	12	12	12	18	24	29	040-
• 35	37		22		16	13	-10	13	16	19	-•25	-034
.45	34		21		18	15	11	15	21	24	31	34
090	19		11		08	08	11	11	11	15	22	22
.75	14		09		11	-00	60	-00	-,11	11	-•11	11
060	03	00.0	•05	03	03	03	-003	-03	-03	900	900	000
1.00	0000		0000		0000	0.00	0000	0000	••	000	•	•

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	52	K = .1004	DEL	DELT AA =	90•9	MEAN AA	=20			
¥	-,19	-	-3.22	94.4-	-5.44	-6.05	-6.25	-6.05	-5.44	-4.48	-3.23	-1.17
x/c						UPPER	SURFACE					
9	60	08.0	64	11.	32	- 63	-,80	- 58	22	•23	• 59	80 80
6	29	999	-87	•82	.82	89	•63	.68	.77	.82	.87	.73
005	11	•23	.52	.70	.84	.88	.88	48.	.81	•70	• 56	•27
000	50	17	•01	•22	•34	643	•46	• 40	.34	•22	•0•	20
•10	38	14	03	•10	.21	• 28	•28	•24	•21	•07	•03	17
•15	.00	•12	•21	•25	•31	• 38	36.	.31	.31	•25	• 15	•12
• 20	41	28	19	- 00	-•03	• 02	•0•	00.0	90	-•12	25	-•31
•25	36	24	18	-•10	+00-	01	*0	+00-	10	15	21	30
.35	31	21	11	08	02	02	02	05	08	11	18	27
645	19	19	12	09	02	900-	02	90 •-	-,12	12	-,16	23
09*	24	17	14	10	07	03	-•10	-•10	-,14	14	17	20
.75	-08	08	08	+0°-	+00-	-004	08	11	08	11	15	22
06	600	600	600	600	•00	•00	•0	•03	•03	•03	•0	•00
1.00	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	00•0	0.00	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00	.92	-80			32	63	80	58	-•23	•23	• 59	• 85
01	4.	0000			-1.73	-2.17	-2.41	-2.07	-1.61	93	43	•14
•05	10	46			-1.93	-2.32	-2.44	-2,21	-1.81	-1.33	89	38
000	1.38	72			-1.53	-1.76	-1.79	-1.72	-1.50	-1.16	87	57
•10	649	71			-1.16	-1.23	-1.33	-1.26	-1,13	-1.00	81	61
• 15	43	59			95	-1.02	-1.09	-1.02	92	79	69	53
•20	42	52			81	87	90	87	74	65	58	45
•25	46	59			79	87	90	82	76	65	57	48
• 35	04.	940-			+9•-	67	70	64	61	640-	43	37
.45	37	40			53	56	09*-	50	50	040-	37	31
090	22	22			33	33	41	-•30	-•30	22	19	15
•75	14	17			20	26	26	-•20	-•20	-•11	14	11
06.	03	03	90 -	900-	-00	60	-•06	-•06	03-	03	0000	03
1.00	000	0000			00.0	0000	0000	00.0	0000	0000	0000	000

				INSTANI	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSURE	COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	53	K = .1275	DELT	DELT AA =	6.07	MEAN AA =	20			
	20	1.37	2.83	60.4	5005	99.5	5.86	99°5	50.6	4.09	2.83	1,37
×/c						UPPER	SURFACE					
	i	3				96	727	• 25		64.	.68	•95
8	2	9 0	96	200	-1-70	-2.24	-2.43	-2.33	-1,99	-1,36	99	0000
100		670				-1.51	-1.65	-1061		-1011	79	29
700	•	94				-1.47	-1.54	-1.50		-1.17	96	68
0.0	470	64				660-	-1.02	-1.06		480-	67	940-
010	970	200				20	20	20		17	07	00.0
610		9 6				62-	85	83		73	09*-	140-
070		000				67	67	73		59	53	41
679		•				56	09	56		140-	740-	34
63.	100					1043	4J	040-		-,36	33	23
.40	970-	000				78-	75-	37		34	27	24
090	27	30				1.26	-226	22		18	15	-e15
• 75	22	-15				0000	0000	0000		00.0	.03	•0•
0%	•0•	0						0		0000	00.0	0000
1.00	0000	0000				3						
						LOWER	SURFACE					
					;	,	22	36	36	64.	.68	.92
00	.78				100		200	600	600	600	-86	•76
•01	000				76.	260	77	11	.73	900	.45	•29
•05	1.04					27	76	180	.24	•16	•01	16
•05	68				• 10	90	60	60.	00.0	03	12	25
•10	61				200	9	400	40-	100-	07	20	30
•15	56					1	700-	*0°-	07	10	20	33
•20	- 45				100	12	15	15	18	21	32	35
•25	48				17	71.	13	- 19	19	22	28	13
935	040-				010		12.	21	-118	21	27	18
° 45	.34				-12	4	- 11	-15	15	19	19	22
090	19				1			-	- 11	11	14	20
.75	14				¥0.	110		40		-006	06	90°-
060	03	03	0000	000	600	600	0000		000	0000	0000	0000
1.00	0.0				•	•		•	:			

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	53	K = .1275		DELT AA =	6.07	MEAN AA =	1 =20			
VV	19	-1.76	-3.23	-4.49	-5.45	90-9-	-6.26	90-9-	-5.45	-4.49	-3.23	-1.17
Š						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	.90		*	•20	17	53	190-	17	63	22	111	
•01	.40	.77		•63	.73	.63	.53	.63	3	.77	11.	
•05	90.	.41	Š	•70	••	*	1	10.	40	.70	63	
0.00	•	•	0	•22	•34	04.	•43	04.	.34	•22	• 07	0
01.	•	10	0	•04	•1•	•24	.17	.21	•1•	-01	03	-16
•15	•	•	7	•21	•28	•28	.31	.31	.25	.21	. 16	• 15
• 20	-35	25		•	03	03	00.0	03	•	16	-19	2
5	•	17-	7	715-	07	400-	***	07	-10	12	21	27
2	•		7	•	05	-00	05	11	•	15	21	-24
	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	7	•	-009	60.	60	12		16	19	23
	•	710-	7	•	14	10	14	17	•	17	20	27
2.5	•		7	•	-00	11	15	15	•	15	15	15
•	•	900	9	•	•03	0	•03	•03	•	00.0	00.0	.0
7	8	0000	Õ	000	8	0	0.00	8.0	•	0.00	0.0	8
						LCVER	SURFACE					
8	••	=	•	•20	17		19	11	594-	22	117	3
100	•	•0•	*	93	-	•	-2-17	-2.32	N	-1067	-1015	
•05	0	42	•	-1.33	-1.05	•	-2.25	-2.36	\sim	-1.09	-1-69	
•0•	ů.	1	•	-1.31	=	•	-1.76	-1.79	~	-1.50	-1.24	-
01.	•	100	•	-1.07	7	-1.23	-1.26	-1.29	-1.23	-1.16	-1.03	
610	•	1.00	•	290-	95	•	-1.02	-1.9	~	92	*	59-
•	•		÷,	2:-	-	•	07	2	060.		3:	590
()	•	**	•	2	- 2	67	1	90	1	2:	70	5
6	•	9	ů	190-	70	67	70	67	1	19	55	
		***	ů	53	000	56	09	09	53	50	\$	31
	•	08	n.	33	37	33	37	41	33	33	-30	77-
5.0	7	600-	7	26	26	23	26	26	23	23	17	
		000	000	600	900	•	12	8	12	•••	03	-03
•	•	•	•))	•	000	000	8	8	0.0	8	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO		K = .1562	DELT	DELT AA =	60.9	MEAN AA =	20			
AA X/C	20	1.37	2.84	4.10	5.07	5.68	5.86	5.68	5.07	4.10	2.84	1.37
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
8	. 63	.92		.76	•	.42	. 32	38	•	~	•	0
•01	•	•24	•	_	1.65	~	-2.28		1.9	4	73	`
•05	~	•	9	-1.01	•26	-1.58	-1.54		•	1.1	-	
•02	~	•	6	_	1-29	-	-1.54		1.3	-1017	• 0	9
•10	7	•	9	91	6	99	-1.02	•	6	1	9	4
•15	-	•	0	07	7.	17	20		7	-	7	
•20	•	54	63	73	1	79	82		~	• •	5	50
•25	3	•	5	62	9	64	67			5	5	
•35		•	5	53	3	53	56	•	5	5	4	
.45		•	*	04	•	43	43	•	*			7
09.		•		37		37	37			7		
•75		•	.2	22	~	26	22		7	-	-	- 15
•	0	•	•	0000	0	00.0	00.0	•	•	0		9
1.00	0	•	0	0.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.0	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00.	• 83	.92	•	.76	•9•	.42	•32	.35	•	99	•	0
•01	•09	•	.76	69.		.95	.92	.92	.92	.92	98	-67
•05	94	90-	N	.53	•65	.73	.77	.77	.77	•65	•	.21
•00	190	•	0	•05	•16	.27	.31	•35	.27	.16	0	20
010	58			60	0.00	90.	60.	•0•	• 03	03	~	32
•15	53	•	27	17	+00-	•	00.0	•	•	-10	~	36
07.	640-	•		14		-01	100-	•	•	14	~	33
670	0			21	12	12	12	12	•	24	~	40
6.30	37	•	7	16		13	13	•	•	22		37
.40	34	•	7	18	18	15	11	•	•	27	~	37
9	-15	•	7	11	+0	08	90	11	08	15	22	22
•75	11	•		09	90	06	11	•	•	60	~	-114
•	E00-1	•	9	-05	•05	000	0.00	•	•	03	0	03
8	0	•	0	00.0	0000	00.0	0.00	•	•	00.0	0	00.0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				NAICHI	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSURE	COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	54	K = .1562	DELT	DELT AA =	6009	MEAN AA	=20			
¥	-,19	-1,77	-3.24	-4.50	-5.47	-6.08	-6.28	-6.03	-5.47	-4.50	-3.24	-1.77
X						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	.92	.73	•52		24	56	70	68	-,39	10	.32	•64
•01	•39	•68	•73		• 68	•68	•63	• 68	•73	.73	.82	.82
•05	01	•23	•52		.77	• 84	. 88	.77	•84	.77	• 66	•45
•05	41	26	•01		• 28	• 40	040	04.	.37	•25	•13	10
•10	31	21	03	.00	•10	•21	.21	.21	•28	•14	0000	14
•15	•08	•12	.18		• 35	•35	• 35	• 38	•41	.41	• 38	.31
•20	38	25	19		90	03	03	0.00	06	60	19	28
•25	33	27	18		10	+00-	+00-	+00-	10	12	18	24
•35	27	24	18		15	08	05	05	11	15	18	24
•45	19	23	16		60	09	60	-•09	60 • -	-,19	19	23
• 60	27	17	14		14	-,14	14	14	14	1.7	17	24
•75	11	11	11		11	-,11	08	-, 15	11	15	18	15
060	•03	•03	90•		•03	•03	•03	00.0	•03	•03	•03	•03
1.00	0000	0000	00.00		00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	00.0	0000	0.00	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00	692	7.	.52			-,56	07.0-	-,68	-,39	01.0	.32	49
0	.33	0,-	65			-2.04	-2.23	-2.17	-1.89	-1.45	- 87	-28
•05	18	58	-1.01	-1.49	-1.93	-2,17	-2.25	-2,25	-2.05	-1.65	-1,25	81
•05	46	T	-1.02			-1.68	-1.72	-1.72	-1.61	-1.35	-1.09	83
•10	55	9	87			-1.20	-1,23	-1.20	-1,16	-1.07	87	+L
•15	46	9	72			66	66*-	-1.02	-,92	86	69	63
• 20	45	5	68			84	84	81	81	71	58	52
•25	- 48	9	68			87	82	84	76	70	59	54
•35	43	5	58			67	64	-•64	61	55	64	37
•45	040-	4	50			56	-,50	53	L-47	74.	37	34
090	26	3	-•30			37	33	-• 30	30	22	19	15
•75	17	2	23			23	23	20	17	14	11	11
06•	-006	••	-•06			03	-•03	90•-	03	0000	00.0	•05
1.00	0000		00.0			0000	00.00	00.00	00.00	0.00	00.00	00.00

		1,38		•95	38	51	-074	- 63		57	56	-034	33	02.7		910	0000	0000			.92	73	20	71	4 6	000		0.00	160-	1000	1034	410	-017	-006	0000	
		2.85		.83	-1.11	06	-1011			73	62	1.067	040-	00		07	000	0000			. 8.3	4	9 4			77	200	970-	35	31	31	19	17	90	0000	
		4.12		990	-1.65	-1022	-1.23	700	760-	73	190-	50	040-		1001	91	0000	0000			77	8	740	000	610	60.	170-	-050	24	25	27	-•19	17	-00	0000	
	20	5.09		740	-2.19	-1-47	1	100		82	73	5.53	64		-631	23	05	0000			1.1		740		*7*	-003	100	10	18	25	27	19	17	06	00.00	•
ENTS	MEAN AA	5.70		36	20.23	100	24	1001-	-1.00	82	-073	24	1	-	37	22	05	000			90	600	760		170	0000	•0	07	15	19	24	11	14	06	0000	3
INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	6.11	5.90	SURFACE	36	000	6697	0001	-1.50	-1.06	8.0	72		000	000	040	-•26	05	00.0		SURFACE		633	80	.77	•27	•03	0000	07	-,15	19	21	11	-014	-03		•
PRESSURE	a AA	5.70	UPPER	.,		-400×	1007-	-1041	-1.02	. 82	1		60.	100	040-	26	05	0000	3	LOWER			.92	•73	•24	0000	0000	07	15	16	25	11	11	40		•
ANEOUS F	DELT	60° 5		**	0	-1022	-1019	-1.26	92	8	1 2 5	010	90.	140-	37	26	500	0000	3			990	.92	•65	•16	03	07	10	18	-19	-021		0			00.00
INSTANT	- 1897	4.12		•	0	190-	86	-1.08	77	7.	9 !	100		140-	-037	22	100					• •	.89	.53	•01	12	14	17	21	10	200	80			-003	0000
	55 K	2.85		;	260	- 38	58	83	67	;	000	790-	53	43	-037	22						.92	•70	•21	-,16	29	- 227	-226	223	100	10.77	1	1 6	110	-003	0000
	RUN NO	1.38		,	• 95	•24	18	53	640-	;	000	56	140-	040-	-034	400			0000			.95	9	02	-135	42	1036	1,26	100		1601	700		100	0000	0000
	-	20		9	.83	58	•16	29	31		***	140-	34	33	0200	1000	770-	000	0000			60	600	- 642	14.1	190-) 4 4 5 4	100	100		11	03	000
		*	X/X		8	•01	•05	500	.10	•15	•50	•25	•35	645	4	9	61.	060	7.00			00	5	200			9 4		0.00	670	6.50		09.	.75	06.	1.00

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	22	K = .1897	DEL	DELT AA =	6.11	MEAN AA	MEAN AA =20			
AA ,	19	-1.77	-3.25	-4.51	-5.49	-6.10	-6.30	-6.10	-5.49	-4.52	-3.25	-1.78
, ,						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	.95	06.	.68	•30	05	37	56	61	44.	-•12	•20	.59
•01	.24	• 58	• 68	• 68	•68	•63	.53	•53	.58	•68	.92	999
•05	15	•16	• 38	•38	99•	.81	66°	.77	.91	• 70	• 56	•31
•05	50	23	• 01	•13	•25	• 28	•37	.37	•28	040	•10	-013
•10	24	17	14	0000	•07	.14	.17	.14	.07	0000	07	24
• 15												
•20	740-	35	25	16	12	60°-	06	-•09	12	19	28	38
•25	41	33	27	24	21	12	12	15	07	27	33	41
•35	31	24	18	15	-,11	08	11	15	15	18	27	-034
.45	30	26	19	16	19	12	16	16	16	23	30	-036
090	24	20	17	17	-014	14	14	17	17	-024	-030	- 34
• 75	15	11	11	-011	11	11	15	22	18	-018	22	-022
060	0000	0000	•03	•03	0000	0000	0000	02	-005	-005	-005	05
1.00	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	00.0	000	000	00.00	000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	•95	060	.68	•30	••05	37	56	61	44	12	200	950
•01	.52	•08	34	96*-	-1.45	-1,89	-2.07	-2.13	-1.92	-1.52	-1.02	50
•02	02	42	85	-1.29	-1.69	-2.05	-2.17	-2.17	-2.01	-1.77	-1037	- 89
•05	38	68	760-	-1.16	-1.39	-1.61	-1.68	-1.68	-1.61	-1042	-1.16	94
•10	48	68	84	-1.03	-1.16	-1.20	-1,23	-1.23	-1.16	-1.10	97	81
•15	940-	56	69	82	95	99	99	66	66*-	86	76	99
• 20	45	55	65	+10-	81	84	90	87	84	74	65	61
•25	940-	54	62	73	76	82	84	79	79	70	62	57
• 35	43	940-	55	61	64	67	67	64	64	61	640-	940-
645	37	47	50	53	53	56	09*-	53	53	47	040-	40
090	19	22	26	-•30	30	30	30	30	26	22	19	19
• 15	17	17	20	17	20	20	23	20	20	17	17	14
06.	03	03	03	900-	900-	09	900-	-•09	-009	03	900-	06
1.00	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	00.0	00.00	0000	00.0	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				NA I CH	NOT AN I AND OUT	L SSON	c coert is	2				
		RUN NO	99	K = .2232	DELT	T AA =	6.14	MEAN AA	=20			
¥¥	20	1.38	2.86	4.14	5.11	5.73	5.93	5,73	5,11	4.14	2.87	1.39
)/x						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	060	16.	.95	60	.71	•52	44.	• 42		99•	.83	•95
01	.50	.24	14	77	-1.36	-1.85	-2.04	-1.99		-1.55	-1.07	38
•05	.13	15	51	79	-1.08	-1,33	-1.44	-1.22		-1.19	90	58
000	29	53	80	66	-1014	-1.29	-1.38	-1.38		-1.23	99	71
•10	31	640-	56	70	84	92	92	95	88	81	70	-,56
•15												
•20	74°-	50	63	69*-	76	76	76	79	73	69	63	54
•25	440-	53	62	62	64	67	67	67	64	62	56	50
.35	34	040-	040-	4J	50	50	50	4J	L++-	44	37	34
645	33	36	36	40	40	43	40	26	-,33	36	-•30	26
090	30	30	-•30	34	-•30	30	-,30	17	30	27	24	20
.75	22	22	18	22	22	18	22	-•18	22	11	18	11
060	02	-•02	00.00	05	0000	0000	00.0	•03	• 03	0000	0000	•03
1.00	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	00•0	0000	0000	0000	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00*	06.	760		88	.71	•52	4.	•42	•52	99•	.83	•95
0.01	.14	.55		•92	•95	.95	•95	•95	• 95	•95	• 86	.73
•02	34	•01		.57	.73	.81	.81	.77	.73	69.	640	•33
• 05	57	27		•00	•20	.31	.31	.27	•27	•16	01	16
.10	55	35		900-	0000	•03	900	• 03	00.0	60	- 19	32
•15	46	30		-•10	+00-	0000	0000	00.0	04	14	23	30
•20	39	29		10	100-	07	01	-•07	-•10	14	26	36
•25	43	32		18	18	10	10	12	15	24	32	37
•35	31	25		16	13	16	13	16	22	25	31	34
•45	31	21		18	18	-,15	18	21	21	24	31	-034
09.	11	-008		+00-	+00-	0000	08	11	-,11	15	19	19
•75	900-	900-		900-	03	90	-00	60	11	14	17	17
06.	0000	•05		00.0	0000	0000	00.0	900-	03	03	06	900-
1.00	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	0.00	00.0	00.0	000	0.00	0000	0000

		-1,79		490	.77	938	100-	14		35																							0000		
		-3.27		•23	.73	•63	.13	0000	-	22																							00.00		
	0	-4054		05	.77	.70	.25	.10		19																							00.00		
	A =20	-5,51		41	.73	84	36	45	•	09	15	-	0	-	1	110-	-005	0000															03		
CIENTS	MEAN AA	-6.13		640-	.68	84	4	7	•	90	12	1	200	710-	# T .	110-	0000	0000		ш													03		
INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	6.14	-6.33	SURFACE	15-	200				170	03		200					0000			R SURFACE					-1.16								- 603		
PRESSUR	DELT AA =	-6.13	UPPER	200	649			160		40		010	-000	900-	07	08	•03	0000		LOWER					-1.16										
NTANEOUS		-5,51			000	-	11.	• 34	•10	0		01.	-000	-009	07	400-	900	0000							-1.10										
INSTAN	. = .2232	-4.54		;			•63	•19	•03	3.5	010	- 15	90.	09	10	01	•03	0000															670-		
	56 K	-3,26			400	•13	.45	•01	07		670-	24	15	12	•39	400-	•03	0000			•64	34	77	87	84	99	- 661	1000	52	14		770-	20	- 00	0000
	RUN NO	-1.78			06.	60.	15	140-	38		41	41	27	23	14	8001	90																20		
		19			•95	•14	15	440-	38		44.	41	27	23	-17	10					860	552	C	9 (4	1 4	. 4	۲ ۹	ŗ <	₹ 4	á.	. T		20	٦	٧,
			2		000	010	05	505	.10	•15	•20	425	35	8	3	9 6		0 0	9		0	3	0	9 0		9 4		9 7 0	672	632	642	9.	e75	060	000

				INSTA	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	PRESSUR	E COEFFI	CIENTS				
		RUN NO	57	K = .2647		DELT AA .	6.18	MEAN AA	1 =20			
Y	20	1.39	2.88	4.16	5, 15	5.76	5.97	5.76	5.15	4.17	2.89	1.40
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	0	0	0	600	-76	170	3	**	**		6	
C		Č	, נ		•		-2-	• 2	•	2	04.	8
•	١ (•	760-	~	~	N	-2.19	1.6	4	67	29
9	N	7	1	79	3.7	-1.29	-1.40	-1.40	1.2	4	76	*
0	26	53	13	-1.05	~	-		-1.35		-1014	0 0	
•10	7	•	09	74	81	88	92		100	- 81	63	
~												7
N	74	50	•	69*-	73	76	76	73	•	60	-	44 -
N	5		67	76	76	79	76	7.7	72			
3	Ç	*	-	47	44	67	05-1		•		700-	EC
4	4	4	4	63	040-	941	36		•		16	92°-
4	-	-		1		1	000	000	•	97	23	19
P	-	,	•			100-	100-	- 34	٠	27	24	24
- (•	7	₹'	18	18	18	18	11		11	90	•02
,	9		9	0000	0000	0000	•03	3.		•0•	• 03	600
Э	Š	•	3	0000	00.00	0000	0000	8		00.0	00 0	90
									•		•	
							2042013					
						NOME'S	CHEN SURFACE					
00.	• 90	0	O	.92	•76	-61	487	*	44.	7.2	9	-
0	~	5	8	66.	1001	1.04	1-01	1001	8			3 2
-02		•05	.41	•61	10.	•	60.	• • •	•	73		797
0	Ť	7	0	.13	•27	.35	.35	35	31	200		
-	•	29	Ä	-•03	•03	90.	•13	60.	03	-03	910-	200
-	4	7	7	0000	• 05	• 05	•05	• 02	00.0	07	17	27
N	m	7	~	07	07	01	.01	-001	-107	41.4-	2	200
~	•	7	7	10	10	07	07	07	12	-118	42.	22
m.	7		7	-10	07	07	10	10	16	22	25	
4	~	•	7	11	11	11	11	11	21	24	24	-131
9	0	0	0	•05	00.0	00.0	00.0	04	08	08	11	-115
	0	•	0	•05	•05	03	03	90-	11	60	-	
6	0	0	0	\$	100	-01	40.	00.0	200	0000	000	
1.00	ŏ	0	00.0	0000	00.0	000	0000	8	0			
									,)	•••	1111

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	25	K = .2647		DELT AA =	6.18	MEAN AA	1 =20			
V X	19	-1.79	-3.28	-4.56	-5.55	-6.16	-6.37	-6.17	-5.55	-4.57	-3.29	-1.80
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
Õ	1.02		-	•39	0		37	3	~	•06	• 39	17.
0	7	Š	7	-82	0	9	• 68	-	9	.77	.77	
0	0	•38	64.	~	.74	.91		. 88		.77	• 59	•
0		Ñ	0	•16	2	3	.37	4	3	•28	• 10	9
~		7	0	0	$\overline{}$.21	~	•14	•07	03	10
•15	•	•	•									
V	•	V	7	•	0	•	0	90	0	•	25	35
~	*	M	~	•		7	_	12	.2	•	4	4
3	7	~	0	•	•	0	0	08	0	•	7	7
•	7	O	0	90	ت	0	0	- 09	7		7	?
9	7	~	7.	•	7	7		14	7		7	
~	08	01	+0	01	+00-	-00+	01	100	11	90		
0	0	Ö	0	60.	0	•	0	•03	0		9	
0	0000	Ō	Š	00.0	3	0	0	00.0	0		0	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
Э	1.02	•	.71	•39	10.	•	37	37	7	90•	-	-
0	S	~	~	11	~	-	_	_	1.5			
0	0	*	~	$\overline{}$	-1.57	-1.01	-1.93	-1.89	~	•	١ –	. 4
0	~	ç		-1.13	~	-		_	1.3	-	•	
07.	42	61	11	94		~	-1.03	-1.03	97	*6*-		
-		Š	9	72	79	02	02	79	~		5	•
N 1	~		•	65	69	•	71	65		•	•	4
~ •	•	ŝ	·	62	65	•	65	62	·	•	1	
٠,	~	4	•	52	64.	•	52	52	4.	•	~	~
	•	~	•	\$	***	•	37	04	•	•	~	~
	7	7	-	- 19	19	19	15	15	0	•	•	0
-		~	~	11	11	•	60*-	•0•-	•	•	•	0
0	0	•	•	0.00	•	•	•0•	-05	0	00.0	• 05	0
•	Ö	0	00.0	8.0	80.0	8	0.0	8	•	•	0	00.0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	58	K = .0321	DELT	AA	6.02	MEAN AA =	5.80			
AA	5.80	4.24	2.79	1.54	.58	01	21	-•01	.58	1.54	2.78	4.23
× ×						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	.01	.54	.82	.91	.93	.91	.91	.89	.91	.93	.82	•59
0,	-2.00	-1.09	46	•05	•25	440	.57	• 54	.48	•31	• 02	56
•05	-2.18	-1.51	-1,15	59	38	20	.11	10	-,17	34	62	-1.15
•05	-1.90	-1.48	-1014	06*-	99*-	54	45	45	51	69	84	-1,23
•10	-1.47	-1.21	-1.02	83	72	09	56	09*-	56	72	87	-1.06
•15	1.95	72	56	740-	24	20	13	13	20	28	04.	090-
•20	-1.08	89	83	+L	65	58	55	58	-,55	62	68	760-
•25	90	78	72	09*-	55	49	64	640-	940-	52	58	81
•35	82	99	60	53	46	43	040-	04	37	43	60	60
649	199-	-,57	50	-047	140-	040-	-,36	04	040-	43	14	50
090	51	1044	41	41	34	27	34	-,31	-,31	34	41	41
•75	37	33	29	29	26	26	22	22	-,18	22	33	29
060	15	-,15	09	12	12	09	600-	-•09	09	60	09	12
1.00	0000	0000	00.0	0000	00.00	0000	0000	00.00	00.0	0000	0000	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	•01	•54	.82	.91	.93	.91	.91	.89	.91	.93	.82	•59
•01	.89	•89	.80	•62	740	•28	•25	•31	647	•65	.83	.89
•05	1.01	.77	.57	•26	•10	•25	13	-•09	•14	•34	• 53	.77
•05	740	•28	•00	15	29	40	740-	• 14	29	11	•00	•25
•10	•16	•03	12	29	38	51	48	45	-•42	19	12	•03
•15	•00	+0°-	17	31	37	48	41	41	37	31	17	1°04
• 20	0000	60°-	22	32	38	45	45	42	38	22	19	600-
•25	900-	14	25	-•33	-•39	770-	740-	42	39	33	22	-•11
• 35	08	17	26	32	35	38	38	-•38	32	26	17	- ° 14
645	02	18	21	31	24	34	34	34	-,31	24	18	15
090	1.05	08	12	20	20	20	20	20	16	05	12	08
•75	0000	03	90°-	60°-	600-	-°09	-00	12	-006	•11	03	900-
06.	•01	•01	01	03	03	03	•01	03	01	•01	•01	•01
1.00	0000	0000	0000	00.0	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	00.0	0000

STANTAMEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	PRESSUR	COEFF 10	CIENTS				
		RUN NO	66	K = .0498	DELT AA	AA =	6.03	MEAN AA	1 ≈ 5.80			
44	5.80	7.36	8.81	10.06	11.02	11.62	11.82	11.62	11.02	10.06	8.81	7.36
\ \ \						UPPER	SURFACE					
000	.08	640-	-1.30	-2.09	-2.78	-3,11	-3.22	-3.08	-2.74	-2.07	-1.44	72
•01	-1.45	-2.59	-3.45	-4.56	-5.28	-5.77	-5.91	-5.77	-5.38	-4.59	-3.77	-2.92
•05	-1.82	-2.60	-3.20	-3.69	-4.22	-4.57	-4.65	-4.57	-4.22	-3.80	-3031	-2.67
•05	-1.54	-2.02	-2.35	-2.71	-2.92	-3.10	-3.22	-3.16	-3.04	-2.71	-2.47	-2.11
•10	-1.24	-1,51	-1.74	-1.89	-1.96	-2,11	-2,11	-2.11	-2.04	-1.89	-1.70	-1047
•15	76	66*-	-1.27	-1.35	-1.47	-1.54	-1.58	-1.54	-1.47	-1.35	-1.19	66
•20	89	-1.05	-1.20	-1.29	-1.36	-1.42	-1.42	-1.42	-1.39	-1,33	-1.20	-1011
•25	78	060-	-1.01	-1,13	-1.16	-1,22	-1.25	-1.22	-1,19	-1,13	-1.04	95
935	-•60	69	76	86	92	89	96*-	99	92	86	76	69
649	1.54	61	64	1.4	71	71	71	71	71	64	61	64
090	37	41	1044	51	740-	48	51	740-	54	41	740-	34
.75	22	22	22	29	22	26	26	22	29	18	26	18
060	600-	600-	600-	600-	600-	12	600-	09	-009	06	-006	03
1.00	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.00	0000	0000	00.00	00.00	00.0	00.00	000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00	90	644-	-1.30	-2.09	-2.78	-3.11	-3.22	20.0	77.6	200	177	
	9 0	94	74			1	1		4107	1007-	** 07	710-
	0 0			010	770-	•	9 0	160-	-613	010	• 34	1.19
	64	1 0 0	4.5	77	•	0 4 0		1.09	800	1001	1.52	1.01
010	012	0.80	8 8 8	540	9 4		14	100	•	0 0		100
31.0	6	220	200	223	649					100		670
•20	0000	•12	•25	25.	32	45	647	9 6	6 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	970	676	610
•25	03	*00	.07	•18	•23	•29	650	•26	220		000	
• 35	-005	•00	60.	•12	•18	.18	•21	•15	• 15	.24	000	0000
.45	08	02	02	*0	•10	•13	•13	•10	*00	0.07	0.0	1.005
090	01	•05	•05	•05	•00	•13	•00	• 00	•05	•02	• 20	05
• 75	0000	•05	e 08	•05	•02	•11	•08	• 08	•05	•02	•05	0000
060	•01	•01	•01	•01	•01	•01	•01	• 0 •	•01	•01	01	01
1.00	0000	0000	00.00	0000	00.0	00.0	0000	00.00	00.00	0000	00.00	0000

INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTANT	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	E COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	59	K = .0498	DELT	*	6.03	MEAN AA	* 5.80			
5	5.80	4.24	2.78	1.53	.57	-•02	22	05	.57	1.53	2.78	4.23
•						UPPER	SURFACE					
8	•	•	.77	.91	68.	.79	68.	.91	98	.93	4	890
•	1.1	4	37	•0•	.41	.54	•	.57	24	.28	100-	53
-05	0	•	98	55	24	-10	0	90 -		4	62	-1-08
•	7:1	-	0	-••1	57	45	•	45		99	- 90	-1.23
2	1.3	-	17	72	56	60	53	53	56	72	79	-1.02
• 15	•	•	*	20	13	09	0	-•09		28	32	-
979	Ç	•	-	65	55	55	•	94		58	- 66	77
2:	•	•	9	55	64	43		43		52	55	99
6	•			43	37	37	3	37	•	43	46	56
	Ç		•	040-	36	36	N	26		33	04.	47
	Ď.	•	7	*2 -	21	21	N	-,24		27	31	**
	7	•	•03		15	15	~	11		15	10	10
•	9	•	00.0	-003	8.0	.03	0	03	•	60•-	03	800
3	•	0000	0000	0000	0000	000	0	8.0	•	00.0	0000	000
						LOBER	SURFACE					
0	09	• 45		.91	60.	.79	60.	.91	•	.93	***	890
0	•	•		.71	• 30	*	•25	.28		•62		2
0(0	100		• 38	•10	05	50	-•09	•05	•26	3	.73
.		28.	•	700-	-•25	26	*	0	.2	•	•0•	•25
• ~			•		62-	.00	51	94.	•	•	16	8.0
1 N								\$;	•	•	17	5
	q	-117					- 650		•	•	-•25	
(7)	9	-114						76-	•	•	62	*!
•	7	10	•	27	46.1			96	•	•	07-	-
•	0	90		12	20	23	200	200	•	• (170-	170
•75	900-	90	-•09	09	09	12	12	600-	-009	900-		
6	0	03		01	03	01	03	03	9	•		
3	Ò	0000	•	00.0	0000	8.0	00.0	3.0	3	•	0.00	0

STANTAINEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTA	NSTANTAMEOUS	PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	9	K = .0770		DELT AA =	6.04	MEAK AA	5.80			
A X/2	5.80	7.36	6.81	10.01	11.03	11.63	11.83	11.63	11.03	10.01	0.02	7.36
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	•19	•	-		2.5		9	(4)	- 2	,		-
70.	1.0	2.0	3.1		5.0			2	3			3
•05	1.5	2.2	7		4.1	•	9			3.9	3	2
•00	*	6	2.		2.9		7	3	3	2.7	2	2.
•10	1.1	1:1	9	•	-2.11		7	-2.11		6		•
•15	7	6	1.1	•	1.5		•	7	_	1.3	1	1
•20	•	•	1.1		1.4		4	-	7	1.2	1	1
• 52	3	6	-	•	1.2	•	.2	-	-	1 . 1	-	7
•35	63	-	82	89	96	96	92	96*-	92	86	82	79
.45	Ş	9	•	•				71		9		
0	*	1	•	•	9	•	*	48	•	4	•	48
•75	7		•	33	6		2	22		-2		
050	0	7	•	•	15	12	600-	09	•	C		•
7	၁	•	•	•	9	•	0	00.0	•	9	30.0	•
						LOWER	SURFACE					
8	_	•		0		•	•	•	•	•		•
		1	4	•	•	9	> 1	-2012	11.07_	v (9641-	0 1
		- 0			1001	0	0	• (7.01		16.51	900
	-		•	080		· «	0	. 87			•	•
•10	•12	•25	.38	.51	6.60	600	95	199			2	32
	0	-		•36	•42	4	94.	94.	940	3	• 32	۱ ۲
2	0	0		•32	3	4	3	• 38	•38	•	•22	
N	0	0		.18	2	~	10	•29	•23	_	•12	.01
M.	•	0		•12	~	2	•21	•21	•18	$\overline{}$	•00	0
•	0	0		•07	~	~	~	•13	•10	0	40,	0
91	0	•05		60.	•13	~	.13	.13	•13	0	•05	0
•	•	3		•0•	•	-	~	• 05	• 05	0	• 25	0
0	0	9	*0	*0	0	0	0	•	•01	0	•0•	0
•	0	0		00.0	0	0	0.00	00.00	00.00		00.0	0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTANT	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	WESSUR	E COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	9	K = .0770	DELT	DELT AA =	6.04	MEAN AA	= 5.80			
	5.80	4.23	2.78	1.53	.57	03	23	03	• 56	1.52	2.17	4.23
×						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	- i	•	-	.91	68.	•	484	6	•	60	07.0	~
100	2.1	1.3	9	01	9 6		57	557	5.	14	- 4	,
•05	-2.28	-1.68	-1.22	73		24	13	10	20	34	-1019	-1.51
•00	1.9	1.5	2	93	7 •-	S	4		S	99	-1-17	1
•10	1.4	1.2	1.0	-•79	*00-	5	26	56	9	09	-1.02	101
•15	6	-	9	-•36	20	-	7	•	~	24	56	
• 20	0	6		71	50	5	5	•	S	62	08-1	
•22	6	•	9	58	64	S	4	•	3	6.00	72	
•35		9	90	43	43	4	4		•	040-	56	9
.45	9	Š	.5	43	36	4	4	•	1	43	47	S
9	4	*		34	31	2	• 2		~	27	-34	1
•75	7	Ň	4	-•25	18	~			~	22	26	2
•	7	0	0	90	-•03	0	0		0	600-	90	0
200	Õ	0	0	00.0	00.0	0	0	•	00.0	00.0	0000	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0		•	•75	.91	•	-89	40	68	680	60	07.0	•
0	•	•	•86	•71	.53	•31	•25	•25	1	. 60	980	986
0	•	•	•	•38	_	•	7	13	0	~	69.	
0	4	e.	~	•03	2	•	4	04	6	~	.17	
~ •		•	7	25	3	•	.5	48	*	~	03	
-	-	0	7	24	e	•	5	***-		~	10	
N	0	0	7	-•29	3	•	Š	42	*	N	12	0
• 25	03	14	22	-•31	39	++*-	47	***-	*	31	17	03
M	0	7		-•26	3	•	e	-•38		~	14	0
•		7		27	3	•	6	37	2	N	02	0
9	0	•	7	-•12	2	•	•2	-•20	7	0	05	0
•75	0	0	0	90•-	0	•	0	-•09	7	0	00.00	0
O.	9	•	9	-001	0	•	0	•01	0	0	*0	0
7.00		•	9	0000	•	•	9	0.0	00.0	0000	0.00	0000

ISTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	PRESSUR	E COEFFICIENTS	CIENTS				
		RUN NO	61	K = .1011	DEL	DELT AA =	90.9	MEAN AA =	- 5.80			
*	5.80	7.36	8.82	10.08	11.04	11.65	11.05	11.65	11.00	10.01	•••3	7.3
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	.2	7	•	-1.67	~	-2.91	-3.17	-3.15	-2.23	-2014	-1.43	•
0	1.1	2.1	3.		•	-5.43	-5.80	-5.80	-5.47	-4.77	-3.91	-2.9
0	5	.2	2.		(L)	4.34	-4.55	-4.58	-4.34	-3.85	-3.33	-2.7
0	1.4	1.0	2.		N	-3.00	-3.12	-3.12	-3.00	-2.77	-2.47	-2.1
4	1.1	1,3	1.		-1.96	-2.00	-2.07	-2.11	-2.04	-1.89	-1.70	-1-
•15	65	61	-1.01		-1.37	-1.49	-1.53	-1.57	-1.45	-1.33	-1.17	
2	£.	6	4		-1.23	-1.32	-1.32	-1.39	-1.29	-1.23	-1.11	5
2	1	8	•		~	-1.21	_	-1.21	-1.15	-1.07	-1.01	6.
3	9		•		06	87	*6*-	94	87	100-	77	•
4	4	5	•		69	99*-	69	69	62	62	55	5
•	3		•		64	43	53	53	*	64	39	3
-	7		•		24	28	32	28	24	21	21	2
6	9	0	•		14	90	11	11	•0•-	03	05	-
0	0	ġ.	•		000	000	00.0	8	00.0	000	00.0	0.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	~	26	8	7	-2.37	-2.91	-3.17	-3.15	-2,23	-2.14	-1.43	
0	86.	•86	.61		•03	•	29	•	11	•10	64.	
•05	.93	.97	.97	.97	1.16	*	.93	• 8	.97	.97	1.16	•.
0	4	•54	•65		18.		•	4	•	9.	.87	•
-	2	• 26			64.	.62	•59	•29	•55	.52	•••	~
- (0	•13	•23		090	• 36	.53	• 50	040	.33	• 23	• 5
40	,	•			97.	6.33	.33	• 30	• 30	• 26	.17	•
y a	7 0	•			619	• 10	•1•	91.	•10	•10	• 05	0.
9 4	•	•			•	61.	010	10.	01.	200	10.	0
t v	0	90.			600	90	90	•03	60.	000	8	0.
0 1	•	•	•		90	•	600	•	8	•05	100-	•
- (0	•	90•-	1	00.0	•	0000	0000	03	03	03	0
\$	0	•	•	0	-•05	02	02	•	05	02	05	•
•	0	•	00.00		0.00	•	00.0	•	8	000	80.0	•

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

	***				-1-0	-1-12								219				147				8	•	•	•	•	٠	•		•	•
	2.76		1	8	1		9	24				- 35	1	- 17	200	8		1	20		00	05	•1•	21	27	22	10		600-	02	000
	1.91		\$.37	-133		690	- 1	42	04-	42	35	70-	77-	40-1	0			**	.26	14	24	29	31	32	31	25	12	12	02	0000
. 5.0	•98		•	257	15	*	46.	8			34	31	-23	-117	02	0		6	584	8	25	34	39	40	100-	34	20	12	12	02	0000
HEAN AA =	05			-67	90		•	•0	59	04.	36	28	23	- 17	02	8		16.		12	**	43	***	47	***	04	28	16	15	05	5
AA = 6.06	25	SURFACE		Ş	-00	3	51	02	43	32	25	31	500-	27	0000	000	SURFACE	8	150	12	40	140-	64	50	64	04.	36	19	10	90	000
DELT AA =	05	UPPER	-95	.57	19	51	5	8	46	43	35	31	-116	17	02	000	LOWER	.95	.43	-004	36	47	64.	14	64	94	34	19	15	08	00.0
DELT	•55		•93	•37	36	69	65	10	52	64.	38	35	29	170-	-00	00.00		.93	•58	•10	33	37	46	43	46	43	34	23	18	-00	00.0
= •1011	1.51		.93	•0•	67	84	84	29	62	55	42	38	29	170-	05	0000		.93	*1.	.34	11	31	-•33	04.	41	04.1	31	23	18	08	00.0
61 K	2.17			5	Ō	1.1	92	4	ø	Φ		3	N	4	0			-		ø	0	15	-	N	m	B		-	_	0	
RUN NO	4.23		•	1.2	Š	1.4	1.1	\$	•	-	Š	*	4	7	0	•			•	-		•01	7	7	7	Ñ	7	7	0	0	Ö
	5.80		•	2.0	7	1.7	1.3			•	Ŷ	4	Ç	7	0	0		• 01	•	669	•	.39	0	0	7	7	7	•	7	05	0
	VV	2	00•	•01	0	0	•10	~	2	N	3	4	090		ç	1.00		00•	•01	•05	0	•10	- (N	N	3	•45	• 60	•75	6	1,00

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	COEFFIC	SENTS				
		RUN NO	62	K = .1300		DELT AA =	6.07	HEAN AA	- 5.80			
∀	5.80	7.37	8.83	10.09	11.05	11.66	34.11	11.66	11.05	10.09	0.03	7.37
•						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	m	7	1.1	-1.57	2.37	19	-3.08	-2.98	-2.10	-1.76	-1.29	59
0	1.0	1.9	2.9	-3.81	4.67	.24	-5.63	-5.27	-5.27	1	-3.58	-2.49
•05	-1.51	-2.11	-2.80	-3.29	-3.43	-4.23	44.4-	-4.37	4.16	-3.71	-3.12	-2.56
0	1.4	1.8	2.2	-2.50		90	-3.06	-3.06	-2.88	-2.47	-2.32	-2.03
_	1.1	1.3	1.5	-1.74		00	-2.07	-2.11	-1.96	-1.77	-1.55	0407-
-	4	9.	i	16	1.17	.21	-1.37	-1.25	-1017	160-	1	
N		6	7.	-1.17	1.29	.26	-1.36	-1.36	-1.05	-1.20	-1.06	- 95
2		ά	1.0	-1.04		.12	-1.15	-1.18	-1.12	~	92	•
Ę,	9		1	84		.87	90	84	84	84	66	
4	S	5	5	62		99.	990-	62	62	52	52	45
•	Ą	ě	4.	94		43	43	43	43	39	33	33
~	.2	.2	7	24	28	28	32	24	24	21	17	17
0	0	•	•	05	-•08	02	90	-•05	05	00.0	02	02
Ŏ	9	Ō	Õ	00.0	00•0	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	8	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00•	•32		-	-1.57	-2.37	-2.19	-3.08	-2.98	-2.18	-1.76	-1.29	59
0	0	8	•	•37	04.	•	040	17	02	•22	• 55	.77
0	0	9	.97	1.01	1.16	.97	1.16	.97	.97	1.05	1.05	.97
ο,	4	5	9	•80	• 0 •	• 84	•8•	-87	1	.76	.73	•62
- •	9	•	245	9	•59	• 59	•62	• 59	•59	• 52	• 55	.33
- (0	-	•56	•33	•43	• 43	•43	04.	04.	•33	• 26	•13
N	9	0	•50	•42	•30	• 36	•33	.33	•26	•23	.17	•01
N	500	0	-	•13	•21	• 18	.16	• 16	•13	.13	•00	05
η.	0	0	•01	•10	•16	•16	•10	•10	•10	•0•	01	07
	0	0	ن	•00	90•	•0•	60•	90•	•0•	•03	03	09
o 1	0	0	60.	•13	•0•	•00	•00	• 02	80.	•05	• 05	01
•	0	0	•	*0	•0•	•0•	•05	• 02	0000	03	03	•0•-
2	0	0000	00.0	00•0	•05	• 05	02	%	00.0	02	05	05
o	0	0	•	0.00	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	8.0

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTANT	ANEOUS P	RESSUR	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	25	K = •1300	DELT AA	* *	6.07	MEAN AA	= 5.80			
×/c	5.80	4.23	2.76	1.50	•54	90	26	06	•5•	1.50	2.76	4.2
						UPPER	SURFACE					
•	00.0	•55	.81	.91	96.	•95	•93	86.	1.00	.95	900	•
0	1.7	;	•	-04	‡	-57	49	090	747	127		
0	-		•	3	10	9	-08	12	22	0401	47.	
0	1.06	7	7.	160-	63	09	51	51	63	72	1 8 -	
~	1.2	•	•	39	54	54	36	-554	47	73		
-	*	•	•	02	•00	•21	•29	64.	117	0	0101	
N		•	•	58	64	43	43	37	64.	522	-662	
N	-		•	64	43	43	38	04.	43	64.	- 58	
m.	9	•	•	38	35	38	35	32	38	10401	42	5
		•	•	28	28	28	31	31	35	31	-38	
• 1	7	•	•	-•09	26	23	23	23	-229	-629	000	
-	7	•	•	60•-	•23	17	28	• 38	17	21	28	•
•	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	00•0	02	02	02	-005	05	-00	0
Ŏ.	Õ	•	•	0000	00.0	800	0000	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	•
												•
						LOWER	SURFACE					
•00	0	S	.81	•91	96•	95	663	86	0001	9	78	
•01	1.04	•95	• 95	.83	190	940	.43	9	200	790	200	
•05	0	•	•61	•34	.18	.18	-08	90-	•14	•26	200	7
•02	3	~	•10	11	29	40	04	36	29	18	100	-2
01.	-	0	•	24	31	14	43	50	34	24	11	0
200	0	•	16	29	36	46	94	43	39	16	23	0
070	9	7	•	34	04.	40	14	47	04	-•31	21	-
52.	-	-	•	38	43	64.	64.	41	41	32	24	1
633	7		•	28	37	04.	43	9 ••	34	31	-•19	1
.40	~	2	•	28	-•31	34	38	34	28	19	15	1
9	9	7	•	16	16	27	19	16	12	12	05	0
675	0	7	•	12	12	20	10	12	12	09	03	0
•	9	•	•	-005	400-	11	05	100-	700-	00.0	70.	
000	Š	•	•	0000	0000	000	0000	8	0.00	0.00	0.0	0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

					INSTRUCTION LICESSONE	1000 Jul	C COELLICIENIS	6143				
		RUN NO	63	K = .1589		DELT AA =	80.9	MEAN AA =	1 = 5.80			
•	5.80	7.37	6.83	10.09	11.06	11.67	11.87	11.67	11.06	10.09	•	7.37
XVC						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	~	•	6	_	1.4	-2.02	-2.93	-2.86	-2.46	•	•	59
•01		-1.67	-2.79	-3.25	-4.64	-5.30	-5.60	-5.66	-5.27	-4.54	-3.66	-3.09
0	•		-	m	•	-3.81	-4.41	-4.4-	-4.27	•	3.	-2.84
0	1.4	1.	2.2	~	~	-2.97	-3.06	-3.06	-2.94	9	•	~
~	1.1	•	1.5	-	~	-2.04	-2.07	-2.07	-2.07		-	~
-	7	•	7	~	~	-1.53	-1.53	-1.53	-1.45		-	~
~	7	•	7	~	~	-1.32	-1042	-1017	-1.20	.2	-	~
~	•	•	1.0	-	-	-1,21	-1.18	-1018	-1.09	7	-	92
3	\$			87	06	760-	94	90	01	•		74
4	S	•	9	69*-	69*-	69	69*-	69	38	9		59
•	*	•	*	43	53	53	64.	43	43	4		43
-	C		*	-•39	39	36	39	39	39	~	28	28
•	4	•	7	11	11	111	08	08	08	7	08	-111
0	3	•	3	0000	000	800	0.00	8	8.0	00.0	•	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	~	•	0	-1.62	-2.32		-2.93	-2.86	-2.46	-1.68	-1.27	59
0	ç	1.26	9		•	0	040	11	•00	34	ì	
0	0	•	0	1.16	1.05	0	.97	1001	1.05	1.05	1.09	1.05
0		•63	-	40.	.91	*6*	\$.	.91	.87	.87	.73	•69
-	N	•45	.49	•55	.65	.71	.71	79.	3.	.71	• 42	*
-	₩.	•23	3	04.	9	• 50	į	*	9.	.33	•26	•1•
N	0	•13	2	•33	•36	•45	•42	• 39	•36	•23	•20	•13
N	9	•05	0	•21	•24	N	•24	•24	•16	•10	•13	•05
M.	0	100	0	•16	•16	•16	•19	.31	•13	•16	01	*0*-
•	0	•0•	•0	60•	•12	•12	•00	•00	• 00	•03	0000	80.
•	9	•00	0	60•	•13	~	600	•13	•13	•00	•0•	•05
•75	0000	0.	*0	•07	•13	•07	•22	• 02	\$	•01	•22	03
ç	9	•	0	•05	•05	•05	•05	• 05	• 05	•05	•05	800
•	0	00•0	0000	00•0	000	0	000	8	0.0	000	00.0	%

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENT

				Z	STANTA	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	RESSUR	COEFFICIENTS	:IENTS				
		RUN NO	63	×	.1589	DELT AA	*	80.9	MEAN AA	= 5.80			
× ×	9.80	4.22	2.76	~	• 50	•53	07	27	07	•53	1.49	2.75	4.22
, È							UPPER	SURFACE					
0	9	5	*8*		86	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.07	86	48.
0	2.5	1.3	•		95	•24	‡.	140	•54	140	•17	800-	61
0	7	9	•		85	T40-	26	19	22	00	36	60	-1.27
0	7.7	1.5	-		97	72	09	57	51	3	72	- 66	-1.28
•10	-1.33	-1.14	95	36	36	65	62	62	140-	62	69	66	-1-03
—	9	9	•		22	10	•05	•13	.37	•17	600	90-	-226
~	6		•		9	55	55	64	43	52	62	-668	- 80
2	-	-	•		58	52	55	43	640-	940-	58	-663	72
3	•	5	•		7	45	42	38	42	42	45	55	61
•	5	e.	•		31	35	38	35	38	38	42	52	52
•	*		•		26	36	29	16	29	29	29	39	3
7	.2		•		24	21	21	21	28	21	24	-132	-1.42
O	0	0	•		02	05	08	00-	05	80-	800-	13	
0	•	0	•		8	00.00	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	90-0
							LOWER	SURFACE					
0	•	3			86	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.07	16.	1
0	0	0	0		86		•58	•55	•52	•9•	.80	1.16	1.10
•05	0	•85	• 73		•50	•25	•10	•05	90•	•22	•38	.18	.73
0	9	4	_		8	N	22	29	22	-018	07	•03	•25
┥,	N	7	9		21	m	37	34	31	24	24	09	•01
~ (~	0	0		23	m	36	36	36	26	19	06	900-
N	0	•	7		24	en .	37	37	37	27	21	18	08
2	~	7	7		32	e	41	140-	35	30	-•30	22	16
(1)	-	7	7		25	N	34	31	-•31	25	16	16	10
•	•	7	-		22	N	28	22	22	19	15	12	03
•	0	•	9		10	0	08	08	-• C8	•05	01	• 02	60.
-	9	•	9		8	0	600-	-•03	03	-•03	0.00	•05	•05
9	0	0	0		8	05	•05	00•0	•05	•05	•01	• 02	•07
•	٥	•	0		00	•	0000	0000	0 0	000	0000	00.0	0.0

				INSTAM	NSTANTANEOUS	PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENTS	ENTS				
		RUN NO	\$	K = .1910		DELT AA =	6.11	MEAN AA	5.80			
¥.	5.80	7.38	8.85	10.12	11.09	11.70	11.90	11.70	11.09	10.12	8.85	7.38
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0		-	i	-	2.1	2.3	2.8	2	2.3	1,0		4
10	1.0		2.	3	4.4	5.1	5.3	5	5.2	4.7	1	,
•05	*	-		-3.17	-3.66	-4.05	-4.19		7		? .	
•05	1:1	1.7	2.	2	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.1
•10	1.1	1.3	1.6	7	1.8	2.0	2.0	-2.05	-1.94	-1.90	-1.71	-1.56
.15		100-		_	-			_	•	•		•
25	7		0	100	10		1029	11.00	70-1-	٠ (•	•
3	-			• 1						•		• '
1	•					•		000	•	9	09.	•
	•	0	Ď.	500-	•	•	•	60	9	3	53	•
	*	M I		43	43	•	3	-•39	6	.3	29	
.75	6	m	Ų.	38	35	3	.3	31		.3	20	
•	7	~	07	-•10	07	07	02	02	05	02	00.0	02
8	•	0	Ŏ	00.0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0
						9	2047					
						LOWER						
0	.33	15	76	-1.27	-2,11	-2,32		•	-2,32	-1.95	-1.36	66
0.	0	0		.41	~	0		-,13	0	.2	•	.74
•05		0	• 90	76.	•6•	06•	_	•	•90	06.	*6.	1.01
000	-	•	.47	• 50	•	•	Š	• 65	9	• 58	• 54	4
•10	0	N	• 29	• 38	•	S	9		5	.41	• 32	•35
•15	0	N:	• 26	•36	•39	.43	94.	•39	•36	•33	•26	•16
07.	0	~	•17	•27	3	3	3		m	•30	.17	.11
•25	0	0		•18	7	7	•26	.21	-	•12	•0•	0
•35	9	0		•12	7	$\overline{}$	$\boldsymbol{\vdash}$		\blacksquare	•00	02	•
5	0	•	•01	80.	0	-	0		0	•0•	100-	100-
3	•	3 (900	- (9	0		0	•03	0000	•
	•	Э 1		•00	0	0	•02	• 05	•05	•05	•05	•
	•	•	*0	•		40.		•		•05	0.00	•05
•	•	-	0	•	Э .	•	0	000	0	0000	•	0

STANTAMEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

					TANTA	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	RESSURE	COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	\$	- ×	•1910	DELT AA	- 44	6.11	MEAN AA	s 5.80			
× ×	2.80	4.22	2.74	1.46	9	•50	10	30	10	• 50	1.47	2.74	4.21
							UPPER	SURFACE					
00	7		•	9.		.91		.91	.93	693	.91	40	69
9	2.4	1.5	-	- 9		•15	.34	\$.41	•	34	0.05	*
•05	2.2	1.7	1.1			144-	0.	19	16		33	- 50	96-
• •	-1.65	-1.55	-1.25	95		65	62	53	56	56	71	900	-1.10
970	1.3	1.1	1.0			51	44	59	59	***-	***-	74	77
.13	4	•	4			94	64	76	76	•		•	•
	} '		•			A +	0	00.	- 20		0	•	68
Ç	•	•	9	•		94.	45	45	42	94	51	S	69
•35	•	•	Š	•		44	47	41	44	740-	47	S	63
.45	ţ	•	£.	•		20	28	28	35	35	35	m	944-
9	29	26	22	2	. 92	26	-•19	19	23	22	26	~	32
•75	7	•				24	24	24	24	27	27	~	-035
0	9	•	0	•		0000	02	02	02	02	02	0	-050
8	•	•	•	•		00.0	00.0	0000	00.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0
							LOWER	SURFACE					
8	-	•	•	•	7	-91	68	16.	.93	66	5	48	243
• •	•	•	0	•	5	-86	• 56	•56	.53	•62	•77	90	
99	•	*1.	• 59	.36	9	•13	•05	01	•05	60.	.32	340	.71
00	~	~	0	2		37	***-	48	48	37	22	11	•03
2	N	0	7	2		36	45	94	84	-,36	23	17	01
•15	N	0	7	2		-•33	36	36	33	-•30	23	10	03
• 20	0	7	7	E - 1		33	36	36	36	30	24	01	+0
•25	0	7	7	3		33	38	38	33	30	25	17	- 11
.35	7	7	7	2		31	34	31	31	25	16	13	07
.45	~	7	7	2		-•30	-•30	30	27	20	17	11	07
3	9	9	7	1		15	19	15	07	07	+00-	+00-	03
•75	Ò	9	0	1		90•-	11	11	90 •-	03	00.0	•02	00.0
000	0	0	0	0.0		00.0	•05	•05	•0•	•0•	.07	•05	.00
8	Ö	•	Ō	0.0		0000	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.00	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				HY I SH I	INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	TE SSURE	COEFFIC	IENTS				
		AUR NO	\$	K2263		DELT AA .	6.13	MEAN AA	- 5.80			
3	5.80	7.36	•	10.13	11.10	11.72	11.52	11.72	11.10	10.13	9.00	7.38
•						CPPER	SURFACE					
00.	~	·	7	7	7	•	-2.76	7	2.2	1	-	76
10.	1.2	-	2.9	?	į		-5.37	*	5.1		-	3.1
200	•	2	~	-	3		-4.22	7	0		M	2.7
•00	1.5	-	2.2	-2	2		-2.99	•	2.8	9	2	2.1
01.	1.3	-1.44	-1067	-	-1.90	-2.01	-2.05	-2.01	-1.97	-1.90	-1.71	-1.56
512	•	_								,		
	•	•	•	┇.	:	•	•	N	•	7	•	•
67.		•	:	•	=	-	-1-10	1.1	-	1.0	95	-
. 35	•	•	•	•	•••	•	•	6	•		•	~
•	•	•	•	•	70	•	3.	•	•			-
3	43	•••	50	50	50	50		43	43	3	36	36
2	1	•	•	•	42		•	7	•	6	•	~
	7	•	•	•	01		07	07			•	0
9	•	•	•	•	0000	•	•	•	00.0	0000	00.0	0
						LOWER	SULFACE					
8	7	29	67	-1.27	-2.08	-2.53	-2.76	-2.76	-2,22	-1.74	-1.20	7
=	1.26	*	•	7	•20	•0•-	03	03	•1•	•23	•	3
~	9	*	1.01	Z.	••	. 62	.97	%	•90	.78	*6.	ž
ê	•29		.50	ŗ		• 50	•65	•••	•••	.61	• 50	.39
9	-57	• 26		14.	7	*	.51	.57		•36	•32	•21
57	*	67.	*	.33	į	.43	į	94.	.36	94.	94.	.1
070		•1	79	000	M.	*	9	• 33	•30	040	•17	9
	***		•	•	17.	97.	97.	• 53	• 15	•21	.12	
7	•	•	•21	61.		. 10	.15	.21	•12	•30	•0•	0
			•		*	.11		•11	•	•01	*0	0
		M (07.	60	•	01.	•11	•10	•	0000	000	0
• 73	• 0 0		•	•	11.	• 0 2	•05	• 05	8	000	03	0.1
8	03	000	0	000	• 0 • 0 • 0 • 0	000	•	700	200	700	000	000
))	•			•	>	3	•		3	5

STANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENT

				INSTAN	INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	E COEFFIC	ENTS				
		RUE 80	ç	K2263	DELT AA	÷	6.13	MEAN AA =	- 5.80			
A/X	9.80	4.21	2.73	1.46	64.	12	32	12	•	1.46	2.73	4.21
						2340	SURFACE					
8	~	•	•		÷		6	16.	96	16.		
9	2.2	-	•		.00	.28	7	7	31	121	700-	
•05	-2019	-1.6	1.1		***	30	23	•	-130	790-	2	
•00	7.7	-	7		•		59	•	- 65	77		
•10	1.3	-	-1.00	05	22	2	3	3	**	77	6	-1-0
•15										•		
• 20	•	•	•	59	52	• • •		64	52	59	65	
• 23	•	•	•	*	54	51	3.	51	54	09	69-	7
33	•	•	•	*	51	144-	51	51	57	09	09	- 7
•	•		•	34	35	35	42	39	42	99	56	- 5
9	•	•	m	32	29	29	2	26	32	36	*	
	•	•	1	31	31	31	31	27	35	35	35	7.
•	05	01	01	07	01	13	01	03	07	07	10	-10
1.00	•		0	800	000	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	00-0	00.0	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
8	(4	•36	•	••2	•	.93	.93	.91	96.	•	•	
0	۰	.9	0		.7.	29.	.53	94.	•65	.7.	.92	
200		• 78	•		.21	•0•	01	•00	•17	•20	.51	
0.	Ň (•25	0		37	41	37	•	41	19	100-	0.0
01:	N .	•	7		2.	42	45	•	26	26	11	0
010	⊣ (•	7'		30	20	73	•	30	20	10	8
2	> (•	7 (33	33	36	•	27	30	*1 *-	-00-
	?	•	7 '		06	33	2.	•	25	14	19	0.1
	•	•	7		-•31	28	22	•	22	13	10	-
	9	•	7		24	24	-•20	•	20	17	11	ò
	9	•	7		19	-19	07	•	11	07	8.0	0
.:	<u>ي</u>	•	0		11	900-	03	•	00.0	900-	00.0	0
000	E C	M (0)	900		-03	•05	•05	8.0	• 02	•05	-01	0
•		•	?		••	00.0	0000	•	0000	00.00	00.0	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

								2				
		RUN NO	*	K = .2680	DELT	DELT AA =	6.17	MEAN AA	08.€			
AA	5.80	7.39	8.88	10-16	11.14	11.75	11.96	11.75	11.14	10.16		7,39
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0			0	1.5	1.6	2.5	~	9	2.3	-	10.3	•
0	1.1	2.	2.8	3.6	4.5	5.0	3	7	4.6	6	3.6	2.8
0		•	6	5	0			6	4.1	8	30	2.7
0	1.5	-	2.1	2.5	2.7	2.9	2	6	2.8	9	2.3	2
~	1.2	-	7	-1.75	-1.90	-1.97	-1.97	-2.01	-1.90	-1.79	-1.64	-1-45
~						,)	•	,		• •
• 20	-1.00	-1.13	-1.23	-1.32	3	1.4	1.4	1.3	1,3	1.2	.2	1.1
~	1.0	1.1	1.1	7.	1.3		6		~	~	1.1	0
m	~		8	•	9	6.	6	6	00	60	7	7
•	Š	• 6	9	•	9	7.	9	9	S	5	3	4
•	6	*	*	•	6	4			3	3	6	7
_	.3	63	3	35	35	35	35	31	27	27	7	
6	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	Ó	•	0	0	0	0	C	0	00.0	0.00
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00	.28	25	0	-1.55	00	3	-2.71	-2.67	-2434	-1.85	-1-18	
0	6.	• 83	.5	•	7	00.0	0		•	63	•	
0	*1*	•6•	9	*6*	0	9	9	•		0	06.	6
0	m	.47	5	•58	5	•	•	1.09	•61	•	• 36	•36
~	.17	• 56	5	.57	5	5	5	.57	e4 •	3	•20	•17
~ (900	• 26	4 (940	4	m (3	940	94.	N	•13	60.
25	200				0.00	6.53		0.50	•24	•17	•	0.
	.03	600	10	212		• -	1 -	9 .	740	9	•	•
4	0	•11	0	110		10	• -		•			• (
•	100-	07	0	00.0	0	9	9	*0	0000	0	-11	26
-	0	•05	0	•05	0	0	0	-02		0	•	•
6	9	•	0	•	0	0	0	• 02	00.0	0	•	•
•	0	0000	0	0000	0	0	0	0.0	•	•	•	•

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENT

				INSTAN	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	RESSUR	COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	3	K = .2680	DELT	*	6.17	MEAN AA =	5.80			
× × ×	5.80	4.20	2.71	1.43	• 45	15	36	16	.45	1.43	2.71	4.20
						UPPER	SURFACE					
000	0	*			16.	.91	.93		663	•86	48.	58
.01	2.0	1.4	9	1	•18	.31	.38	38	31	•	044-	9
•05	-2.36	-1.94	1.3	-1.00	-072	-•61	51		68	600	-1-24	-1.63
• 65	1.0	1.5	7	1	77	71	62	9	73	٠.	-10.16	
910	1.3	1.1	5	•	70	99	62	o o	74	85	-1,00	-1.15
.20	Ò	0	-	72	65	65	62	89	89-		6	1
•25	6			71	69	- 69	71	12	•	77	. 0	3 8
.35	9	9	S	53	47	14-	51	: 4	127	090	14.4	32
.45	4			32	32	32	39	: 2	- 3	94	0	
09.	29	•	26	22	26	26	26	26	32	29	-36	940
.75		7	2	24	24	24	35	35	-135	96 -1	35	C
•	0	0	9	05	00.0	02	05	200	-005	1000	700-	100
8	•	9	0	0000	0.00	00.0	0000		000	0.00	000	0
						9	1000					
						LOBER	SURFACE					
0	01	64.	.72	•	.91	.91	.93	.91	.93	986	**	5.58
6		0	.92	• 63	.68	.62	•65	•59	99.	68.	.92	.95
700	0	-	S	•36	•25	•13	•00	60•	.13	.32	• 63	.78
• 02	4	-	7	-•26	-•33	41	7:	*	33	15	•00	•25
9:	ė.	ġ.	7	29	-•36	26	26	39	36	23	11	•26
9	Ò,	7	7	26	04	33	-•36	30	-•30	16	06	•03
070	0	7	7	30	-•30	36	04	33	24	20	07	01
57.	7	7	7	30	-•36	33	38		30	25	14	06
	7	7	7	- 28	31	34	28	25	-•16	13	10	05
	7	7		-•33	-•33	30	27	27	24	17	07	+00-
090	7	e .	6	-•30	30	-•30	30	22	19	11	トマ・ー	07
• 75	~	7	-	14	11	1	11	90	03	00.0	• 02	•05
•		900-	-00	-003	03	03	-•03	02	*0	•0•	•0•	40.
3	Š	9	•	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	8	800	00.0	00.0	0.00

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	67	K = .0321	DEL	DELT AA =	••05	MEAN AA	MEAN AA = 13.80			
44	13.80	15.35	16.80	18.05	19.01	19.61	19.61	19.61	19.01	18.05	16.81	15.35
VX						25000	SURFACE					
0	-4.95	-6.06	•	-7.31	-1.91	~	71	•	•	27	22	18
•01		•	7.6	•	-1.97	~	75	70	65	61	91	91
•05	5.0	•	6:9	v	-1.65	~	51	•		59	83	51
• 0 •	•	÷	4.2	-3.86	-1.53	-1.19	76	70	+90-	67	199-	55
•10	2.4	2	2.6	N	-1.41	~	18	•	73	69	62	69
•15	2.3	2	2.4	~	-1.32	~	79	•	67	55		37
•20	7.5	-	1.6	~	-1.63	~	81	75	65	68	65	65
• 25	1.3	-	1.3	~	-1.56	~	91	•	61	190-	58	67
.35	1.0	7	6	16	-1.46	~	-1.01	•	71	68	58	75
.45	9	•	-	-1.01	-1.36	~	-1.12	-• 76	73	69	55	76
0	4	•	*	76	-1.10	80	-1.14	80	73	73	56	59
.75		•	*	\$ -	93	75	-1.15	82	78	71	09	64
•	~	•	0	23	36	36	60			04	-126	001
3	3	0000	•	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	00.0	0000	000	0.00	0
						LOVER	SURFACE					
8		•	•	•	-1.91	-1-72	11	9	32	27	22	- 18
100	•	ä	-2.10	2	•	-01	•42	• 60		•76	.79	276
700	-	•	•	•	•92		1.16	1.12	1.08	1.12	1.08	1.08
•00	7	1.13	•	•	1.13	1.09	1.09	.97	*6.	16.	• 90	45.
•10	06.	.93	96.	1.00	• 90	•86	. 83	•76	99.	•63	• 60	• 66
610		• 75	•75	7	•75	797	99.	.58	.51	04.	\$	140
•20	•	•67	.67	• 10	.67	.57	.57	14.	040	•34	•34	040
•25		.51	.51	.51	.45	643	.37	.31	•26	•20	• 23	• 26
6.89	N	•34	.37	.37	.31	•25	•25	• 19	•10	-01	•07	•13
.43	N	•29	• 25	•50	•19	• 16	•12	•06	8.0	03	00.0	•00
	N	•2•	•24	•24	•16	•16	•05	•01	.01	90	90	60.
. 73	┥,	• 15	•00	•00	•03	05	•0•	-•11	17	14	14	02
•	-	00-	•	•	05		16	•	27	27	22	05
1.00	9	•	00.00	0000	00.0	800	00.0	00.0	00.00	0000	8	000

INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	19	K0321	DELT	* *	6.02	MEAN AA	MEAN AA = 13.80	_		
AA .	13.80	12.24	10.79	9.54	8.58	7.98	7.78	7.98	8.58	9.54	10.78	12.23
,						UPPER	SURFACE					
00		1.7	7.9	•	1.3	•	•	6		0	2.	6
•01	7	4.1	4.9	•	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.0	3	3		9
•05	•		0.4	•	3.2	6	0	2.9	•	10		S
• 05	9	2.0	2.7	•	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.	9	6	6
•10	~	1.4	1.9	•	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	-		7	2
•15	*	1.3	1.0	•	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	7	-		2
•20	~	1.0		-1.22	~	1.1	1.1	7	1.	-1.25	-	-1047
•25	•	•	1.0	•	1.0	•	6.	1.0		7		7
•35	~			•	•	•	1	1				•
• 45	•	-	Š	•	S	3	3	S	99.	9		•
09.	~	*		•			*	•	•	•		•
•75	75	34	27	19	23	23	23	27	•		•	•
•	3	0	W	•30	•	•	•		.30	~	.26	26
8	0	0		00.0	0	0	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	0
							SUPEACE					
0	3	-1.77	6	-1.96	3	90		0	66	95		
0	-	6	4	•	Ş	•			•	.36		•
0	0	-	0	1.08	1.12	1.08	0	0	1.06	1.12		96.
0		06.	0	• • •	0	.82	• 82	• 82		•	1.05	•
~	ń	•	99•	09•	5	.53	•	5	.53	•63	•	•
~		•	5	.47	4	9	•	3	04.	-47		• 68
2	m	3	**	•37	~	• 30	N	3	.34	.37		15.
•25		~	~	•23	• 20	*1.	_	•14	•20	•23		04.
3	0	~	~	.13	~	•10	0	0	•10	•16	• 22	.31
•	•	90•	-	•0•	0	•03	0	0	90.	•12	• 12	•22
•	•	0	•16	.13	-	.13	~	•13	•16	•13	• 50	•32
•75	11		•00	•00	•12	•00	60.	60.	90•	•00	• 15	•18
6	7	05	-•10	•	7	•	~	~	•14	•14	• 14	•17
0	9	0	0	0000	0	000	00.00	00.0	00.00	0000	00.0	00.0

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	PRE SSURE	COEFFIC	:IENTS				
		RUN NO	99	K = .0497) DELT	- 44 -	6.03	MEAN AA	. 13.80			
₹	13.80	15.36	16.81	18.06	19.02	19.62	19.62	19.62	19.02	18.06	16.01	15.36
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	- ◆	5.6		~	-4-90	-2-01	-1-67		8	000	-1.42	-1.24
• 01	-	9.2	7	. 0	-8.62	1	-2.73	-1-11	-1.92	-1-02	11.14	70-6-
•05	•	6.7	-		-6.32	-2.24	-1.49	• ,	-1-22	11.02	-1.77	7
•05	9	4.1	*	•	-3.46	-1.53	-1.37		- 9	5	-1-10	
•10	-2.52	-2.75	-2.94	-2.82	-1.99	-1.57	-1.30	-1.00	92		-1-03	92
•15	~	2.6		N	-1.92	-1.86	-1.50	-1.09	2.1	2.	-1-15	73
•20	-	3.6	-	_	-1.50	-1.66	-1.19	-1.03	7	70	-1-15	4
• 25	~	1.5	5	~	-1.50	-1.77	-1.28	9			-1.01	
•35	~	1.1	7	~	-1.30	-1.69	-1.40	-1.07	97	-	78	*
• 45	76	•	•	1:	-1.19	-1.51	-1.40	~	-1.05	-1.01	76	91
09.	640-	1	5	70	97	-1.07	-1.10	97	67	-1017	73	-1.04
	100		*	3.	82	71	71	93		93	62	-1.15
6	•50	•	0	19	33	16	26	53	+0	43	43	43
200	0000	0	ð	00.0	0000	00.0	00.0	8.0	00.0	00.0	8	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	•	5.6	7.3	~	-4.90	-2.01	-1.67	95	•	10	-1.52	-1.24
0	-1.07	-1.73	-2.32	-2.63	68	•		. 32	1.13	. 35	•	•
0	•	9	Ą	•28		•	•96	8:1	•	1.16	1.04	1.04
0	~	0	-	1.13	1.13	1.09	1.09		•	1.01	.97	•
┛,		0	Ō`	.93	96.	• 90	.86	.76	.80	.73	.73	.70
~ (•	• 78	•78	.75	• 82	.71	;	19.	.61	:	• 58	.54
N	•	•	•	.73	.73	.67	• 60	.50	• 50	.47	04.	:
N	•	4	•	40.	• 54	*	.43	¥.	.31	.31	. 20	.26
m ·	m	•	•	.37	.37	.31	.20	.19	27.	•19	.19	.10
•	N	•25	~	•32	• 5 9	•19	•1•	80.	8	•0•	•0•	•03
•	~	2	~	•2•	•24	•	•16	•	•09	•0•	.13	•05
	~ •	~	~	•12	•0•	•	0000		•	09	02	
000	410	410	0	600	05	-13	000	29	16	13	16	10
	•	•			•	•	0000	•	•	000	000	•

STANTAMEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE	RESSURI	COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	99	K = .0497	DELT AA	*	6.03	MEAN AA	- 13.80			
4	13.80	12.24	10.70	9.53	16.57	7.97	1.1.1	7.97	15.8	9.53	10.70	12.23
, }						UPPER	SURFACE					
8	4	.2	•	~	000	90	•••	9	-1-04	-1.61	-2.63	-3.60
10.	ů	è		n	-3-39	-9-19	-3009	-3.04	-3.55	00-4-	-4-97	-6-0-
•05	-	-		-3.22	-3.10	. •	-2.91	-2.91	-3.22	-3.50	-4.28	-4-91
00	~	-	2.	\sim	-2.36	-2.26	-2.23	-2.26	-2.42	-2.57	-2.91	-3.25
910	7	-	1.5	-	-1.76	-	-1.72	3-1-	-1.76	-1.91	-2.10	-2.29
•15	•	•	-	-1.32	-1.56	-1.56	-1.50	-1.62	-1.62	-1.80	-1.96	-2.10
•20	7	9	6	~	-1015	-1.19	-1-15	-1.19	-1.19	-1.20	-1.00	-1-5
•25		9.	•	-1.04	-1.04	-1.04	-1.00	-1.04	-1.07	-1.16	-1.22	-1.31
•35	•	Ş	5	1	61	*	01		***		94	-1.04
•45	76	52	41	59	62	62	62	3:	62	62	73	73
09.	•	-	- 6	39	39	42	42	45	42	94.	**	990-
.75	•			23	34		30	27	05	27	30	27
•	*	.2	•	•26	• 30	•26	•26	.30	• 30	•26	• 23	23
1.00	•	0	0.0	000	0000	000	00.0	8	0000	00.0	8	00.0
						LOWER	SUMPACE					
000	•	22	•	-1.14	000-	90	0	•	-1-8	-1.01	-2.63	-3.60
•01	• 63	•	•63	-57	•	19.	.76	1.01	0	.30	.07	45
•05	•	1.04	•	1.00	1.12	1.00	1.04	•	1.04	1.00	1.30	.92
50	90	•	70	280		79.	-82	7	3		.97	1.05
			•		•	\$	000	000	• ^ •	•	2.	2.
• 15	040	.37	- 97	•37	3	0.37	.37	.37	04.	:	*	19.
070	•34	•2•	N	.27	.47	.27	.27	.27	•30	.27	*	.50
52	•1•	• 11	•11	11.	*1*	.11	.17		•17	.20	• 20	.37
680	•	•	Ò	400	-01	•16	10.	•01	•10	•10	.19	•25
.43	•	•	03	00.0	•0•	• 03	•00	• 03	\$	•0•	• 19	.19
9	•	•	0	•	•0•	. 13	•0•	•0•	. 7 .	.13	• 20	47.
•75	•	•	•	90.	• 1 •	8	•0•	• 03	80.	.12	• 12	.15
0	10	10	0000	•	•	116	•11	•	•1•	.11	•1•	•1•
1.00	•	•	•	0000	0000	8	0.00	8	8.0	0.00	000	800

STANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAI	NSTANTAMEOUS .	PRESSURE	COEFFICIENTS	ENTS				
		308	6	K0754		DELT AA .	••••	MEAN AA	. 13.80			
¥,	13.60	15.36	16.01	19-07	19.03	19.63	19.03	19.63	19.03	10.07	14.82	13.36
						KEMAN	SURFACE					
00•	•	-5.81		-6.23	- 3	15.4	-1.01	-1.33	-2.10	-1:36	-1.72	-1.33
.01	7.5	•	ö	-11.16	•	-2.63	-1.57	-1.52	-3.19	-3.29	-3-19	-3.09
•05	5.6	•	7	-7.69		~	-1.42	7-1-	-1.01	-1.73	-1.77	-1.73
•05	3	•	;	-4.72	•	\sim	-1.71	3.7-	-1.47	-1.00	-1.19	-1.04
•10	5.6	•		-3.05	~	-2.21	-1.63	-1.40	-1001	-1.26	-1.11	-1-8
•15	2.3	•	5	-2.69	\sim	~	-1.9	-1.50	-1.32	-1-09	-1.20	7
•50	1.6	•	:	-1.79	\rightarrow	\sim	3.7-	-1.41	-1.37	-1.12	-1-25	1
•25	ŝ	•	-1.62	-1.56	~	3:7-	\$7.7	\$:7-	-1.37	-10:0	-1.19	-1.01
.35	-1.14	-1.20	-1.20	-1.07	-1.27	-1.56	-1.53	**·1-	-1.30	-1.23	= -	97
• 45	•	•	***	7	~	-1.51	-1.51	7.7	-1.19	-1.22	87	-1.00
09.	•	•	*:	59	93	~		100-	67	-1.07	67	~
.75	7	•	45	53	67	-1.23	2.	3.	3	97	71	
•	7	•	03	16	43	3.		3	36	43	23	33
8	000	0000	0000	00.0	0000	8	8	8	8	8	8.	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
Э.	•	•	7.3	77.0	***	16:4	-1.01	-1.33	-2.10	-1-	-1.72	-1.33
0	•	1.7	-2.45	-2.80	-3.07	3	-110	.13	10.	.10	• 26	.42
0	•	•	*	•50	•16	.7.	Ž.	8:1	1.16	8.5	20:1	700
0	0	•	~	1.09	1.13	1.16	1.10	•	1.39	1.05	1.01	.97
97.	?	.93	• 96	1.03	1.03	1.03	į	•	••	.7.	. 73	.7
~	•	~		•	•		ŗ.	;	•••	•		7
~	•	•	~	.77		.77	.67	.97	• • • •	• 30		.47
~	•	•	•	.57	.57	.97	•	04.	.37	ž.	**	.28
m.	n 1	•	4	.43	*	.43	.34	.22	.22	.19	.19	.19
•	~	N	N	.32	.35	• 5 9	.1.	-12	•0•	•0•	. 12	•0•
•	№:	n.	•	• 50	.32	. 28	•16	8	•	60	•0•	6
~ (┛,	•	~	27.	61.	21.	•	3	-002	05	60.	8
6	7	7	•		•0•	8	03	•1•	10	-10	8.0	03
•	•	•	00.00	30.0	0000	•	••	8	8	000	00.0	8

				INSTAN	TAMEDUS	PRESSUR	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		AUR 40	69	K0754	ספר	DELT AA .	•	MEAN 4.A	. 13.80			
4	13.80	12.23	10.70	1.33	16.57	7.96	7.76	* .	1.50	9.52	10.11	12.23
č						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	13	-1.19	-1.01	-2.59	-3.79		*	0	2	•••	75	000
0	•	3.6	4.2	-5.27	-6.34	-7.01	-1.07	-2.99	-3.24	-3.14	60-6-	-2.99
•05	•	3.2	•	-4.24	-9.19	-5.97	-1.00	-2.59	-3.07	-2.99	~	-2.87
0	•	5.2	2.7	-3.03	-3.40	-3.80	91	-1.00	-2.26	-2.23	-2.23	-2.20
~	•	1:5	2.0	-2.21	-2.40	-2.60	2 -	-1.03	-1001	-1.61	-	-1.61
~	~	1:0		-1.9	-2.10	-2.34	61	.00		79	2:	61
~	•	1.2	1.3	-1.41	-1.50	-1.63	-1.03	70	-1012	-1.15	-1-19	-1-15
~	0	1:1	1.2	-1.31	-1.40	-1.50	16	70	-, 65	91	16	91
		•	•	-1.01	-1.04	-1.10	50	***	75	76	***	-
4	•		•	00	•••	1	55	16	***	62	62	59
•	•	•	ç	53	53	53	0	•••-	36	64	64	64
~	0	-	•	30	34	34	75	53	27	27	27	27
•	~	~	7	.20	.23	07.	36	13	.13	. 23	. 20	.20
0	0	0.00	0	0000	00.0	0000	0.00	8.0	00.00	0000	8.0	3.
						1						
						1000	SUMPACE					
00.	13	-1.19	•	-2.59	-3.79	00.4-	•	•		66	75	-1.00
·	.7.	•			51	-1.04	~ .	.57	0		.7.	.67
0	•	1.00	0	1.00	•	•	~4.	2.08	.92	.92	.92	*
0	7	• • •	•	1.05	1.00	1-13	.67	.67	.67	19.	.59	
-	•	000	•	.73	••	0	χ.	0.	• 36	.36	.33	36.
→ •	ě,		•	•6	.63	.63	- 20	. 20	• 50	•13	• 20	-20
	Ď.		~	•	• > •	0	•	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•01	*	~
N 1	~	• 1 •	~	.31	0		•0•	8	90.	•0•	•0•	•0•
	0	0	-	0.	\$ 2.		-10	07	*0	01	10	01
	Õ (60	О.	6.19	• • •	6~	13	13	8.	60	03	-00
	0	•0•	~	• • •	• ~ •	.20	•0•	-00	05	.01	.01	•05
.75	-	•	0	•19	•13	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	17	11	•0•-	02	8.0	8
•	~	•	~	.17	.17	.17	25	10	09	00.0	00.0	•
Ō	0	0000	0	00.0	000	0.0	00.0	8	8.	0000	8	0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

13-80 13-36 16-87 18-40 19-4					2002	ME 5 304	COLPTICIENTS	. I E M 1 3				
19.36 19.30 19.3		AC# 10	70	K1021	730	. AA T	•0••		•			
Color Colo	13.00	15.36		10.00	• • • • •	19.05	19.05	19.55	8.01	10.00	10.03	15.36
1						-	SURFACE					
1	-	:	-	67.6-	-0.93	-7.67	-	-1.03	-1.00	-1.93	-2.03	-2.10
1	•		•	-11-7	-12.09	-9.67	2:~	-1.00	-1-00	-2.90	-3.61	-4.02
1.00		6:3	7	-7.09	-7.07	4.23	-9-19	-1.09	-1.76	-1.0:	-2.10	-2.61
1.2	•	7:	:	-4.71	79.9-	-3.34	2.7	-1.5	-1.51	-1.70	-1.57	-1.63
1.00	?	2.7	*	-3.01		-1.00	-3.54	-1.33	-1.20	85	-1.29	-1.10
1	Ç	2.1	~	-2.28	-2012	-2.03	-3.2	-1.62	-1.72	-1.16	91	-1001
-1.07 -1.00 -1.01 -1.02 -1.02 -1.03	•	1:0	-	-1.65	-1.65	-1.7	-2.60	-1.50	-1.65	-1.27		-10.4
101 -1.07 -1.11 -1.08 -1.18 -1.07 -1.01 -1.09 -1.00 -1	•	*:	-	-1.53	-1.67	-1.65	-1.92	-1.50	-1.53	-1-20	-	-1-8
	0	1.0	1.	-1.00	-1.14	-1.67		-1.67	-1.00	-1.00	-1.31	-1-27
17255567710077100771007710077100771007710077100771007710077100777070		•		0.7	-1.01	-1.20	*	-1-62	-1.21	-1.00	-1-20	-1-0-
	•	•	•	*		8	07	-1.03	8		0	64
1722331345279616050505050505050	~	-		**	71	90	75	43	20.1-	71	50	02
10 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0	~	~	•	34	92	70		00				
LOWER SURFACE 1.0 -1.0 -7.33 -0.29 -0.93 -7.07 -3.00 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03 -1.09 -1.03	۲	•	•	0	8	8.0	00.0	8	8	8	0000	8
LOWER SURFACE 1.0 - 1.0 1												
						1001						
-1.00 -2.56 -3.00	~	i	,-	42.0-	-6.03		•	-		-1.93	-2.03	-2-16
90	-	-	~	-3.09	-3.40	-2.62	23	2:	1.10	•	.11	
10 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 1	•	.3.	• 52	09	13	•	•	. 73	••	÷		5
10 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110		•	•	•	•	÷	•		:		•••	•
10 10 10 10 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.		•••	*	•	*	*	÷	į	2.	.72	•	•••
. 19	₫.	:	. 73	r.	ç	5.	.72	•••	~••	3.	7.	7
.38 .4; .90 .92 .99 .52 .44 .30 .39 .25 .22 .22 .22 .26 .20 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00		.99	***	•••	:	. 7.1	*	.92	~	*	.33	.33
.26 .27 .29 .39 .30 .34 .20 .20 .20 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00	-		. 90	-92	.99	~ 6.0	1	2.	. 93	.23	.22	•25
.19 .29 .29 .32 .27 .29 .20 .00 0.00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .0	~	• ~ .	. 33	χ.		. 33	~	.20	•	• • •		-05
.12 .19 .19 .19 .19 .00 .00 0.0000101010 .10 .10 .10 .10 .10 .10 .10 .10 .10	~	52.	**	.32	**	2.	-22	.12	8	00-0	.63	80.0
.10 .10 .13 .13 .07 .040107131416252525252525252	~	•19	•13	• 7 •	•13	-13	ò	8.0		10	10	***
••• ••• ••• ••• ••• ••• ••• ••• ••• ••	~	.10	. 13		.07		01	10-	13	10	16	***
	•	•	-05	~0.	05	-0	13	-:-	23	22	23	111-
	•	•	•	0.00	0.00	8.0	00.0	8	8.0	00.0	8	8

INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEPFICIENTS

		FOR RO	0,	K 1027	200	0617 44 •	• • •	****	MEAN 44 - 130			
44	13.00	12.23	10.11	16.4	•••		1.70	2.2		15.0	10.76	12.22
						2000	SUBFACE					
8	•	-	-	-1.30	-1.07	=	2	-1.02	-1.02	-2.03	-2.09	-3.76
0		-		-3.33	- 3-23	3.5		-3-13		-5-10	***	**
20.	•	-2.10	2.0	5.7	-2.99	-2.00	-2.00	2.7	×	-4-15	46.4	-5.19
•00	-	-	~	-2.23	-2.20	-2.20	-2.20	-2.29	~	-2.92	-3.10	-3.40
.10	-	-	-	-1.33	-1.33	-1.37	-1.33	2	-	-2.00	-2.10	-2.67
.19	-	-		-1-51	-1-21	-1.20	-1-20	-1-36	-	-1-57	-1.72	-1.62
.20	-	•		-1.03	-1.00	-1.19	-1.30	-1.21	-1.24	-1.31	-1.37	-1-49
. 23	-				74		. 2	-1.01	-1.00	-:-10	-1-19	-1.31
	•			9	•••-	11	71	70	~ .	-1.	91	16
		•		52	50	••••		59		76		
000	•	•			35	***	~ .			52	*:	*
.73	•	•	•	35		20	31	35	62	39	39	
00.	•			11		-00	90	•1•-	• 1 • -	10	10	-11
1.60	•	•	•	00.0	8	8	8	8	8	00.0	8	8
						LONE	SURFACE					
0		7	-1.20	X:1-	-1.07	•	•	-1.02	-1.62	-2.03	-2.35	-3.76
0			•	16.		.73	.73	.70		*	10.	3.
0	•••	•	1.00	•		. 97	. 37			.93	16.	
0	.7.			.72		į	0	.97	3.	.73	.83	.90
~	•••	-99	. 3 4	7		•••	.49	~~~	•	•99	•69	.76
~		2.	.62	-27		**	.27	.24	.27	.34	\$. 55
~		.23	.17	.17		.13	.10	.10	.17	•23	.33	.39
• 5 5	•1.	•13	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•0•		•00	•5	•0•	8	•13	• 55	.30
	0	•	*!.	03		03	03	03	3.	•09	•1•	• 20
4	•	•	•	•0•-		0.00	03	09	0.00	90.	•	•
•	•	•		90*-		06	02	06	02	00.0	•0•	.12
-	0	•	•	07		100-	01	*0*-	01	•01	40.	.00
	11	900-	000-	•00		00.0	•05	02	00.0	•05	• 05	2.
0	0		•	0000		0000	00.0	8.0	00.0	00.0	0.00	00.0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				I LOK	7	PRESSUR	E COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	11	K = .1230		DELT AA =	•	MEAN AA	H.			
¥,	13.80	15.37	16.83	18.09	2	19.66	19.86	19.66	19.05	18.09	16.83	15,37
						UPPER	SURFACE					
	•	6.1	7.3		-9.11	-9.30	-5.3	_	~	-1.34	-1.20	93
	7.8	9.5	1.0		-12.41	-11.69	-6.5	_	1.	-1.09	-1.29	-1.24
	2.0	6.7	7.5		-8.08	-7.43	-3.3	- 85	7	87	-1.06	-1-10
0	3.7	4.1	4.5		-4.80	-4.17	-2.5	~	1	-1.10	-1.21	-1.16
010		-2.82	-3.11	-3.20	-3.15	-2.43	-2.72	65	-1.28	70	66	46
- 1	2.1	2.3	203		-2.38	-2.17	-2.5	~	1.	-1.01	-1.62	-1.16
2	9.1	1.7	1.8		-1.84	-1.78	-1.8	-1.43	1.	-1.18	-1.84	-1.09
N	4.1	1.5	1.5		-1.53	-1.65	-1.7	_	1.	-1.19	-1.77	86
3	1.1	1.1	1.1		-1.14	-1.37	-1.6	_	-	-1.37	-1.11	-1.07
4	6	6.	6.	*6 -	97	-1.28	-1.4	~	1.	-1.18	87	-1-18
9	9	Š	Š	63	99*-	80	-1.1	~	1.	93	90	97
1-1	4	5	•	53	64	75	6.1	_	1.	79	82	57
6	~			34	55	69*-	1.1	_	-	66	58	37
3	•	0	0	00.0	0000	00.0	0.0	ာ့၀ • ၀	•	00.0	00.00	0.00
						4 TWO						
	1											
00	~	-	3	-8.70	-9-11	9.3	-5.36	-1.61	-1.61	-1.34	-1.20	93
0	7.	1.8	2.6		3.	•	2	•	-•01	•23	• 36	•45
000	•	m	~		•	7	94.	69.	69.	.77	.81	1.09
0		•	•	-87	.87	•	.87	.87	. 79	-87	• 72	99.
-	- 1	- 1		68.	.93	0	68.	.82	• 65	•59	• 65	. 48
- 6	0	n .		6	•72	•	•65	• 58	. 48	.41	.38	•31
¥ (M (n	•55	• 58	•	.58	64.	•33	•26	•20	•17
N	N	ñ I	•	. 41	• 50	•	.47	.36	•25	• 16	• 16	•0•
6.4	**************************************	•23	• 26	67.	.32	•32	• 26	•17	• 65	•05	00.0	03
•	•	• •	• (3:	670	• (44.	•	50.1	00.0	0	000
0.7	5 (7	о,	71.	0	G.	•	•	-10	-10	21	21
~ (5	•	7	100	•	0	*0*	13	25	28	22	22
	0	0	0	02	900-	7	•	•	38	41	33	22
•	•	9	•	0000	•	•	•	•	000	0000	0000	0000

INSTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

)							
		RUR NO	22	к • .1230	DEL	DELT AA .	4.07	HEAN AA	MEAN AA - 13.80			
**	13.00	12.23	10.76	9.50	•••	7.93	7.73	7.93	7.	9.50	10.76	12.22
7/4						COPER	SURFACE					
00.	93	-1.11	•	_	97	•••	6	-	-1.29	•	~	-
.01	1.5	5		-3.20	~	-2.04	-2.94	-3.09	-3.56	7	-5-36	
•05	1.2	2		~	7	-2.68	2.7	2	-3.22	9	١ (١	
•00	1.1	-	2	2	2	-2.11	2.1	2	-2.44	9	1 N	4
•10	-	ř	-	-	-	-1.23	1.1	7	-1.52	9	N	2
.15	~	•	-	-	•	-1.26		-	-1.31	9	-1.77	
• 20	1.2	•	•	-	-	-1.12	1.1	-	-1.21	2.	~	-
#1 PE	1.2	•	•	•	•	92	•	•	-1.04	0	-	-
.35	1.1	•	•	•		71	-	•	84		91	-
• • 5	•	•	•	•	•	99			73	1.	80	•
C 4 ·		•	•	•	•	94	1		32		52	
. 75	-	•	•	•	•	94	~	•	31		*	•
•	•	•	•	•		17	5		17	7	-114	•
1.00	0	•	•	•	0°0	0000	00.0	8.0	000	0000	8	0
							SUMPACE					
00.	93	-1.11	-1.00	-1.07	16	-	93	-1.07	-1.29	-1.89	•	-3,76
.01	•••		04.	*	.67	•			•	•		1
.0.	69.	.77	• 77	•		0	14.	• 85	• • •	•••	100	69.
.03		0	.93	0.	0.		.53	-97	09.	19.	.75	. 79
C	69.	66.	. 35	•32	69.	. 42	• 35	.38	• 42	04.	• 59	.62
67.		07.	• 1	• .	07.	-	.17	.17	•20	.27	.34	14.
• 20	-10	•01	• 01	10.	•	0	•0•	.07	100	•17	• 20	.39
• 53	0	0.00	•	0	02	05	•0•	.02	• 0 •	•11	• 16	•25
. 33	~	60	7	7	•	0	•	•	•	•05	•05	1
•	0	•0•-	7	7	•	7	•	•		•	•03	90•
•	~	21		7	•	~	•	•	•	•	•	0.00
. 73	13	22	10	19	16	13	•0•-	40	07	+0	01	01
0	~	22	• 2	~	•	0	•	•	•	•		00.0
1.00	0	00.00	0	0	•	0	•	•	0.0	•		0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				I MESTAM	TAMEOUS	THE SELE	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	CIENTS				
		2	7.5	130		DELT AA .	•0••	MEAN AA	. 13.00			
5	13.00	15-37	10.03	10.09	10.00	19.67	19.61	19.67	19.0	10.09	16.04	15.37
<u> </u>						43440	•					
8	:			-6.63	-9.30	4.93	-9.07	-6.55	-1-6	-	•	-1.07
•	-	i	•	•	-11.99	-12.92	-11.69	****	-1.09	-	-	-1.40
70.	-5.73	-	-7.31	-0.01	-0.43	-0.91	20.7-	-5.35	-1.0	-1.26	-1.22	-1.14
•0	5:	i	•	-4.77	-4.9	-4.92	7	•	-1.54	-	-	-1.30
97.	?	~	•	-3.25	-3.30	-3.20	-2.50	-2.10	-1.37	•	7	60
. 13	-	÷	•	-2.33	-2-63	-2.03	-2.53	•	-1.02		-	-1-26
- 20	•	-	•	-1.67	-1.65	-1.67	-1.90	~	-1.74		-	-1.21
• 53	1.3	-	•	-1.59	-1.65	-1.65	-1.03	_	-1.65	•	-	-1-16
. 13	0	•	•	1101-	1701-	-1.64	20-7-	_	-1.57	•	1	-1017
?	•	•		97	160-	-1.04	-1.00	_	-1.00	•	-	-1.32
•	•	•	•	59	63	99	:-	_	-1.03			000
.73	•	•	•	42	57	57	700-	_	-1.00	•		42
•	7	•	•	20	04	43	•••	75	*			04
00.	•	•	•	0.0	00.00	0000		0000	8000	0000	00.0	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	•	-5-44	-7.24	-6.43	•	-1.93	•	- 0	-1.40	-1.66	-1.25	-1.07
0	0.	-	2	-3.21	-3.74	-3.93	-3.49	-2.37	13	ı	•	
0	•	.42	•10	•	•	28	17	.10	.73	. 6.	.97	.01
• 0	•	•••	?	••	06.	.07	06.	96.	.90	.83	-87	100
-	-		•	69.	•	.96		1.16	.82	-82	. 59	64.
-	•	•65	.72	9.	• 19	.7.	.79	.72	•62	.72	*	. 36
~	•	64.	• • • •	• 50	-62	-62	-62	-62	94.	• 36	• 30	8.
~	(**		• 50	3.	•95	. 47	• 33	•25	• 22	•22
n	~	97.	• 5 6	.32	.32	\$	•35	• 26	.17	• 58	•05	600-
•	-	• 5 5	• 55	•52•	•52•	•32	2.	• 19	•00	•03	•00	00.0
•	-	•15	•12		.12	0000	00.0	8.0	90	10	•	-10
~	~	•	• 16	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•01	•10	•16	8	01	13	13	13
•	0	00.0	00.00	•	•	05	90	13	27	30	•	27
0	0	•	•	0000	0000	0000	8	8	00.00	0 0	•	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	72	K = .1589	DELT	* *	6.08	MEAN AA	= 15.80			
AA	13.80	12.22	10.76	9.50	8.53	7.92	7.72	7.92	8.53	64.6	10.75	12.22
						UPPER	SURFACE					
	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.0	6.		0	1.0	1,3	1.9	2.0	3.4
0		4	9	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	3	3.9	4.7	6
0	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.8	7	2.6	2.7	2.8	3.4	4.0	4.6
0	1.4	1.8	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.1
_	8	-	6	.2	.2	1.2	1.1	.2	1.4	1.6	1.9	2.0
~	1.1	1.1	6	1.3	1.1	9	1.0	1.2	9	1.2	1.2	9
2	1	.2	6	1.0	1.1	-1.09	0	1.1	1.1	.2	6	9
•25	-1.25	-1.13	65	92	95		-1.01	95	0	1.1	1.1	1.1
'n	1.0	80	5	.5	9	9	9	-	8		6	8
4	0	9	5	5	5	9	9	9	-	7		1
Ś	9	6	4	6	6	4	42	4	5	3	5	1
~	5	20	6		6	~	6	3	3		4	
O,	9	7	.2		~	7	-,11	7	7	7	7	7
	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ō	0	00.00	00.0	00.0	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00•	4	S	S	-1.07	97	7	88	0	-1.34		-2.03	•
0	•	4	5	•	•70		•73	9	•		•	•
0	O.	8	8	0	•89	0	•89	3	1.09	نه	4	•
0	9	ø	9	ø	Ø	9	.57	•	• 64	~	~	1.35
	4	4	4	3	•35	3	•28	.48	• 45		ø	•
_	2	N	2	2	~	Ø	•17	~	•24	ā	4	•62
2	~	~	9	0	0	0	•07	~	•10	~	•	•39
~	-	0	0	-	0	0	•05	0	•16	_	N	•36
a	0	0	0	0	7	0	•	9	•	0	_	•20
	~	7.		7	0	0	60•-	0	•	9	0	•12
9	7	7	7	0			•64	7	•	0		•08
• 75	22	16	16	7	07	04	+0	+0	+0	01	01	.16
6	.2	7	7	_	0	0	02	0	•	0	0	•05
•	•	0	3	•	•	9	•	•	•	0	•	00.0

				INSTA	NSTANTANEOUS	PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENT	CIENTS				
		RUN NO	73	K = .1910		DELT AA =	6.11	MEAN AA	1 = 13.80			
∀ 1	13.80	15.38	16.85	18.12	19.09	19.70	19.90	19.70	19.09	18.12	16.85	15,38
•						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	4.2	5.4	6.9		9.2	9.6	9.0	8.8	~	2.5	1.5	1.3
0	7.0	8.6	0.0	1.3	2.3	-	2.6	0.0	2	2.3	1.8	1.7
0	-5.52	-6.28	-7.22	-	-8.24	4.8	•	-7.3	•	2.3	5	1.5
0	3.5	3.9	4.3	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.0	0	2	2.5	1.6	
~	2.0	2.3	2.4	5.6	2.7	-2.53	2.5	-2.13	2	-2.08	-1013	-1,31
-15	1.5	1.7	9	0	٥	-	0		9		,	
10	1 9		4		1 . 5		7 - 7	: .	0 - 7	•	-	•
16			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	9		•
١ ،	2	1	101	7	7 0 7	701		;	1.03	0 - 7	j	-
•	•	-	•	9	•	•	6	-	1.1			~
9	*	*	ŝ	*	5	3	Ş	•	٥.	0	7	•
~	4	4	*	*	4	5	5	•	4	9	*	•
ç		-009	12	_	21	.3		•	9	0	W	33
0		0	0	00.0	0	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	8.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	-2	5.4	6.9		9.2	6	0.6		2	5	-1.54	-1-31
•01		-1.58		0	-	-3.82	-3.82	-3.15	-1.00	2	16	•
0	6	7	5	6	0	.01	0	•		0	•	1.16
0	0	0	0	0	86.	*6*	76	.91	0	6		•
~	^	60	8	8	8	• 90	.87	.87		~	• 64	• 58
~	9	~	8	8	•	.89	•86	• 86	•	•	• 55	• 55
2	9	~	-	8	•	.84	.87	• 80	-	•	.51	1
2	5	9		ø	7	.71	.71	• 65	5	4	04.	*
S.	S.	4	5	•	3	• 53	• 50	į	4	2	•17	•14
.45		•33		3	6	• 39	•39	•33	N	.13	•07	*0•
9 1	3	9		GO.	3	• 34	•30	64.	~	0		0.0
• 75		2	2	N	N	•22	•25	•10	0	0	•	•16
000	•21	621	•21	ĭ	•	• 12	•10	•	03	15	23	12
•	•)	၁	9	Э .	00.0	00.0	00	•	•	•	•

INSTANTAMEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	73	K = •1910	DELT	T AA T	6.11	MEAN AA = 13.80	- 13.80			
AA X/C	13.80	12.22	10.74	9.48	8.50	7.89	7.69	7.89	8.50	74.6	10.74	12.21
•						UPPER	SURFACE					
00.	1:	1.2	1.3	45	*	•	45	•	7	3	2.	2.8
• 01	5.0	•	Ġ.	m	2.8	2.	N	•	3.0	3.3		
.02	1.1	2.0	2.9	-2.76	.5	2	N		2.3	3.2	3	-
•0•	-1.00	~	-2.06	-2.09	~	-1.97	-1.97	•	2.1	4		3.1
010	7.7		5	95	5	-	-1.04	-1.09	-1,22		-	-1.40
• 15												
07.	4	-1.43	~	86	66*-	•	0	-1011	7	7	4	7
• 5 3	1.1	•	5	•	75	1	7	•	6	0	-	1.0
	91		7	39	94	32	65	74	78	81	91	87
• • •	S	1	9		30	3	5			•	(4)	
0	S	•	~	•	~	7			4	2	4	
• 75	÷	•	1	43	~		7	32	7	3	•	
•	-	•	-	•	~	•	0	•	0	0	0	0
8	0	•	0	•	0	0	0	•	0	00.0	000	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
8	-1-00	-1.21	-1.35	45	45	45	45	64	78	-1.31	-2016	- 5
•	~	•	•	• 59	•	.71	~	• 68	•62			
~	1.16	~	1.20	1.20	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.20	N	1.48	
0	•	0	•72	•72	.72	.61	•61	• 65	•69	•72		.91
0		•		.31	.31	•25	~	•35	.38	•	•54	•
			•	. 36	.27	.27	2		•34	4	.51	5
0	?		• 20	•	.21	.21	~	• 25	•31	•	**	•
6	**	~	~	•	*1.	•	•1•	.17	•25	6	.37	. 48
• • • •	-	• • •	0	00.0	•0	8	0	•11	•11	~	•17	~
•	•	•	0	•	•0•	•	0	•0•	.07	~	•13	N
0	•	0	-11	•	•	•	0	•0•	•15	~	•19	_
5	0	0		• • •	•	•	0	• 10	•13	•13	.13	•19
		0	-00	01	•	•	7	•	.15	~	.15	~
8	•	Ö	•	•	8	000	0	8 •	8	0000	00.00	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

21 -3.64 -3.94 -3.64 -3.94 -3.64 -3.94 -3.64 -3.94 -3.64 -3.1 -3.64 -3.1	40000000000	-6.93 -8.41 -2.37 -3.09 .53 -3.09 .91 .94 .77 .82 .74 .82 .74 .82 .59 .65	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00
		910	2 .30 .30 2 .19 .19 2 .12 .10

		12.21		-3.02	-5.89	-4.95	-3.30	-2.35	-1.58	-1.38	-1.07	79	59	040-	15	0000		-3.02	37	1.04	.87	•64	•62	• 554	.42	•29	•23	•26	•16	•21	0000
		10.73		-2005	-4.83	-4.05	-2.97	-1.99	-1.49	-1.26	-1.00	79	53	51	12	0000		-2.02	• 14	1.16	.80	.51	•72	44.	• 34	• 23	• 16	• 23	• 16	• 15	0000
	_	9.46		-1.35	-4.02	-3.52	-2.61	-1.86	-1.43	-1.17	91	72	64	43	12	0000		-1,35	***	1.36	• 76	440	.41	•35	• 28	•17	•10	•15	•10	•12	0000
	= 13.80	8.49		- 83	-3,11	-2.99	-2,37	-1,72	-1,27	-1.08	87	65	46	-,36	- 0 09	0000		83	•62	1.16	690	• 38	•34	• 25	• 20	•11	•10	•15	•10	•12	000
IENTS	MEAN AA	7.87		59	-2.61	-2.68	-2,12	-1.40	-1.14	99	81	55	42	040-	09	0000		59	• 68	1.20	.72	• 28	•31	• 25	•17	• 0 2	000	.08	• 0 •	•12	00.00
COEFFICIENTS	6.13	7907	SURFACE	40	-2.66	-2.57	-2.09	-1.36	-1.18	99	78	55	39	-,36	600-	0000	SURFACE	40	.77	1.16	.57	•21	•24	• 18	•11	•05	0000	000	•01	•10	00.00
PRESSURE	T AA =	7.87	UPPER	45	-2.61	-2.61	-2.09	-1.36	-1.08	96	74	58	29	25	12	0000	LOWER	45	· 74	1.08	.57	•21	•24	• 15	•08	03	80	03	07	•01	00.00
INSTANTANEOUS	DELT	8.49		- 035	-2.91	-2.65	-2012	-1.36	-1.08	93	68	48	32	32	18	0000		-,35	•68	1.12	.57	•25	•20	• 15	800	90 •-	12	03	-°04	01	0000
INSTAN	= .2247	9.46		• 50	-3.42	-2.95	-2.21	-1.36	-1.05	87	55	37	-,32	040-	24	00.0		• 50	•56	1.16	.57	•25	•24	•15	800	60	12	14	10	900-	0000
	74 K	10.73		-1.31	-3.72	-3.14	-2,31	-1.40	-1.02	78	52	48	45	51	36	0000		-1,31	• 41	1.08	•65	• 31	•27	• 21	• 11	03	08	10	10	03	0000
	RUN NO	12.21		1.8	4.3	-3.48	2.4	9	80	9	9	ຜູ	40	4	39	0		-1.83	•20	1.16	.80	• 41	8	• 28	• 14	0000	08	06	10	12	0000
		13.80		S	6	-4.08	9	95	00	-	-	6	S	S	- 33 8	0		-2.50	7		8	4	m	3	-	0	0	-	16	-	0
		AA × ×	:	000	• 01	•05	e 05	-	.20	2	935	• 45	090	.75	6	1.00		000	•01	• 02	•05	-	• 15	N	N	m.	• 45	090	•75	6	0

				INSTAN	TANEOUS	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENT	CIENTS				
		RUN NO	22	K = .2664	DELT	LT AA =	6.17	MEAN AA	A = 13.80			
AA,	13.80	15.39	16.88	18.16	19.14	19,75	19,96	19.75	19.14	18.16	16.88	15,39
) \						UPPER	SURFACE					
6	-3.98	Š	-6-46	-7.36	86.85	-9.75	-10.13	-9.89	03	-7.36	-5.88	-4.31
000	-7.05	8	-9.92	-10.43	-12.44	-12.90	-12.90	-12.49	27	-9.62	-7.75	-6.44
005	-5.48		-7.15	-7.90	-8.43	-8.58	-8.43	-8.13	41	99.9-	-5.29	-4.46
500	-3.67	4	-4.42	-4.79	16.4-	-5.03	46.4-	-4.70	24	-3.67	-2.79	-2.46
.10	-2.49	-2.72	-2.94	-3.08	-3.21	-3.21	-3,12	-2.99	-2.49	-2.08	-1,36	-1.04
•15												
•20	-1.74		~	ç,	-1.96	-1,99	-1.93	~	-1.83	-1.77	-1.52	-1014
•25	-1.47	10	-1.62	9	-1.68	-1.62	-1.68	-1.62	-1.65	-1.62	-1.50	-1014
• 35	-1.10	1,	~	.2	-1.20	-1.23	-1.23	-1.26	-1,30	-1.33	-1.26	-1.04
.45	83	06	86	83	86	86	90	93	-1,11	-1.04	-1.18	97
090	56		56	ů	640-	53	56	53	99	70	93	87
•75	43		040-	4.	36	040-	43	43	T40-	32	43	43
060	600-		12		18	18	21	21	27	36	39	53
1.00	00.0		00.0	0	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.00	00.0	0000	00.0	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00.	-3.98		ø	-7.36	æ	-9.75	-10.13	-9.89	O.	-7.36	-5.88	-4.31
•01	76	-1.61	-2,15	-2.88	-3.49	-3.82	m	-3,73	-3.24	\sim	-1.55	91
•02	1.04	.77	.57	• 33	•01	90	10	.01	.13	.45	• 73	. 89
0.05	0.98	.98	1.02	.98	*6*	0.98	86°	.98	*6*	*6*	. 98	.87
•10	•74	.77	.84	06.	.87	06.	• 90	• 84	48.	.80	. 74·	•61
.15	.79	.72	.86	• 86	.92	.89	.89	.86	.82	.72	• 68	. 58
•20	•64	.71	.74	• 84	.84	.84	• 84	.77	.77	.71	.67	.51
.25	.54	•59	•65	.68	.71	.71	.71	• 68	• 62	•54	. 48	.37
•35	.38	.41	44.	.47	.47	• 50	• 50	44.	•38	•32	• 26	• 17
.45	•29	•33	• 33	•36	• 33	• 33	• 33	• 33	• 26	•20	• 13	•0
090	64.	• 38	• 38	•38	• 38	• 38	•30	•30	64.	,19	• 15	•
•75	•25	•25	•25	•25	•25	•25	•19	•16	•10	•0•	+00-	07
	-21	•	•15	•15	.12	.12	•10	•04	40.	01	01	-00
1.00	0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	0000	0.00	00.00	0000	0000	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		PLE NO		K = .2664		DELT AA =	6.17	MEAN AA	= 13.80			
5	13.00	12.20	10.71	9.43	8.45	7.84	7.63	7.83	8.45	9.43	10.71	12.20
, :						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	-	t	~	-1.16		4	4		83	~	-1.97	2.8
0	*		4.1	-3.42	-3.01	-2.76	-2.81	2.8	3.3		0	-5.79
0	7:	3.7	3.3	2.9	9	9	9	9	0	3.4	4:1	
0	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.8	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.7	3.2
	6	1.2	-	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.9	2.1
~												
~	•		8	96*-	-1.05	-1.05	-1.11	-1.14	1.3	.3	1.4	•
~	•	9.	4	÷	8	8	6.	1.0	7	1.1	~	-
•	6	•	.2	ë.	6	ø	9	1	8		6	•
•	•	1	6	e.	7	4	4	3	9	9	•	•
•			7	94	7	_	.2	.2	*	*	N	•
~	•	*	Š	ŝ	n	~	.2		•	*	3	•
•	*	5	.2	.2		-	-	0	0	0	0	
Ō	00.0	00.0	ŏ	9	Ō	00.0	0	0	0000	0000	00.00	000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00.	-3.21		7.	-1.16	7	04	64	59	00	-1.21	-1.97	-2.83
00	4		• 29	•	• 62				•65	14.	•1•	-,20
0	0	0	-	1.12	۲.	-	~	→	2	1.24	1.20	•
ο.		∞ .	-	69.	9	5	•	•	•	.80	. 87	*
٠,	2	4 4	m (80 e	(m)	N	NI	N.	•	*	•8•	.67
40		* 0	9 0	• • •	V -	V	7	• (• 55	.65
40	7 (2	V -	62.	- ۲	17.	170		970			•
	10	1 C	0	•	9		: 9	4 C	v -	- 17		
4	0	0	0	08	0	0	0	0	. 0	.13	16	
9	O	0	0	•	0	0	0	7		•23	• 26	10
7	7	7	7	•	0	0	0	0	~	.13	97.	6
6.	7	•		•	0	0	0	0	-	.10	• 12	.12
0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	8	8

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

					- THE COS	THE SOUR		C I W I				
		RUN NO	92	K0321	DELT	- YY 1	6.02	HEAN AA	. 18.00			
*	18.00	19.55	21.00	22.25	23.21	23.81	24.01	23.61	23.21	52*52	21.01	19.55
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	-7.40	-1.84	-2.22	-1.79	-1.09	90	85	71	76	57	52	38
.01	-11.01	-1.96	-2.71	-1.96	-1.38	90	79	79	*1	69	79	63
•05	-7.70	-1.52	-2.10	-1.69	-1.27	76	57	53	57	48	7	36
•09	64.4-	-1.71	-1.49	-1.40	-1.37	93	06	87		81	01	11
•	-2.74	-1.47	-1.09	-1.03	76	45	37	37	31	26	26	09
.15	-2.18	-1.96	-1.47	-1.38	-1.20	-1.06	-1.02	97	97	93	93	75
• 50	-1.62	-2.03	-1.39	-1.23	-1.10	97	91	86	81	81	78	69
•52	-1.43	-2.14	-1.43	-1.28	-1.16	98	92	89	86	86		75
•35	-1.04	-2.06	-1.37	-1.17	-1.00	90	81		77	84	77	71
•	87	-1.17	-1.45	-1.19	-1.09	-1.01	62	87	80	**	62	69
• 60	70	-1.16	-1.30	-1.05	-1.02	84	84	81	88	88	84	70
.75	67	86	-1.01	-1.01	-1.09	78	-1.05	90	90	*6 *-	97	- 78
8	67	61	82	91	97	-1.09	97	91	91	91	85	79
1.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	000	000
						LOWER	SURFACE.					
•	-7.40	-1.84	-2.22	-1.79	-1.09	90	85	71	76	57	52	38
•	-2.52	32	23	000	.24	*	.37	•	•••	.53	. 59	.62
00	. 28		.80		.92	.92	96.	96.	96.	.92	96.	.92
60.		. 84		.83	.76		.76	.76	.72	69.	69.	.65
9	. 63	.73		0.		.01	.67	.67	.63	99	.60	.57
:		•	.57	.57	.57	*	4	*	. 20		04.	?
020	. 58		4.	24.	•	. 42	.42	.42	.42	.32	•35	• 25
67.	•	•		97.	.32	. 26	62.	• 50	• 50	:	.18	.18
. 35	.26	. 23	.17	.17	.17		:		=	•0•	•05	•05
•	.16	60.	0	•	00.0	00.0	00.0	.03	.03	-13	90	-00
9	0	*0	.00	00.	13	16	16	12	-10	23	23	19
2	.00	•1:-	- 50	50	26	32	29	32	29	35	29	26
06.	-10	28	36	36	45	53	-4.			65	39	45
1.00	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	92	K0321	DELT	1 44 .	6.02	MEAN AA	18.00			
*	18.00	16.44	14.99	13.74	12.78	12.10	11.96	12.18	12.78	13.74	14.98	16.43
ć						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	43	47	47	-,38	76	-3.02	-3.44	-3.54	-3.96	-4.67	-5.56	-6-64
.01	69	-1.06	-1.22	-1.01	-2.28	-5.90	-6.43	-6.59	-7.23	-7.87	-9.04	-10-10
•05	0	53	57	57	-1.94	08.4	-5.13	-5.34	-5.71	-6.09	-6.79	-7.33
.00	75	71	81	65	93	-3.16	-3,35	-3.22	-3.66	-3.81	-4-12	4-4-
.10	15	*0	60	0.	65	-1.97	-1.97	-2.08	-2,30	-2.41	-2.58	-2.69
.15	35		80	75	-1.20	-1.69	-1.69	-1.78	-2.09	-2.00	-2.27	-2.37
.20	69	72	78	62	-1.26	-1.42	-1.52	-1.33	-1.49	-1.33	-1.74	17.7
57	72	75	61	69	-1.34	-1.25	-1.31	-1.31	-1.31	-1.40	-1.51	
.35	57	71	74	77	-1.20	*6*-		81	-1.04	-1.07	-1.07	-1.07
•	69	51	76	98	-1.12	69*-	51	62	84		87	
•	67	09*-	***	-1.05	81	25	25	43	53	4		
.75	75	71	- 90	2.	45	.22	9.		03		1	
000	82	76	0		***	16	19	16	61	- 33		
1.00	00.0	00.0	000	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	00.0	000	0	0	0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0		47	47	38	76	-3.02	-3.44	-3.54	-3.96	4.67	45.64	44
.01	.69	.69	.75	.75	99.	23	32	39	40	-1.05	-1.53	-2-11
000	40.	. 80	. 92	48.	08.	.80	.72	.72	.72	09.	84.	4
60.			. 58	**	.58	.69	.72	69.	.76	.76	.76	9
	•	•	06.	•	•	.57	.63	.63	.67	.73	.73	.77
200			. 33	97.	• 5 6		•		.43	\$	•61	.61
2.5							.33	• 33	.38	.45	94.	.51
3.5	.00				•	07.	• 23	• 53	• 50	• 5 8	.34	.37
4			3	500	60.	. 11	•	:	80.	*!	• 23	•23
4	10		000	*0*	60.	•03	60.	*	90.	•00	•00	.12
2			71.	01.	• 1	00.0	00.0	0000	00.0	0000	• 05	00.0
		47.	07*-	-11	-17	05	-05	05	05	05	02	05
0	0000	900	100	000	61.	500	500	05	08	08	08	13
*	•	•	•	•	0000	00.0	0.0	0000	00.0	00.0	0000	000

				INSTAN	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	PRE S SURE	COEFFICIENTS	TENTS				
		RUN NO	7.7	K = .0497		DELT AA .	60.03	MEAN AA	- 18.00			
AA x / C	18.00	19.56	21.01	22.26	23.22	23.82	24.02	23.82	23.22	22.26	21.01	19.56
è						UPPER	SURFACE					
000	8.0	0 •9	~	•	2.9	6	2	N	2	7	2	~
0	1.5	9.7	2.4		3.6	3.0	2	m	2	7	8	•
•05		-6.56	-2.19	-2.52	-2.81	-2.77	-2.72	-2.85	-2,31	-2.06	-3.26	-3.31
•05	4.6	3.5	1.9		2.6	2	2.	N	2	2.	2.	~
-	2.8	2.0	1.6		1.2	1 .2		_	-	7	1	•
-	2.4	2.0	2.		1.5	1.1	1	_	1	7	-	-
2	1.8	1.7	1.8		1.3	1.3		_	1.	7	-	-1.04
~	1.6	1.7	7	•		1.1	•	_	98	•	•	92
•35	1.1	1.5	1.8	•	0	6	•	90	81	•	•	74
*	8	1.2	1.5	•	0	1.0	87	46	62	69*-	•	69
9	9	6	1.2		1.1	7	•	67	84	99	•	43
~	•		ä	•	.2	1.3	•	~	06*-	78		82
0	5	-1	1.0	•	1.0	0	-1.03	-1.03	-1.09	46		65
0	•	0	0	•	0	•	•	8000	00.00	00.0		8
							204.00.00					
	•					LONGA	SURLACE					
00.	-8.06	6.0	0	-2.97	-2.97	-2.92	-2.83	-2.78	-2.31	-2.08		-2.50
0	5.9	-2.01	45	48	9.	51	51	84	16	19	-,13	07
•05	0	N	~	•80	•76	.72	•72	.84	.84	• 8 •		48.
0	0	9	• 91	.91	.87	g,	.83	.83	.83	.83	1.24	.76
-	0	9		•83	•83	.77	• 80	• 80	•73	19.	190	• 60
~		.78	•71	•68	•61	Ð	.61	.61	•61	•5•	• 50	.47
N	9	•		•55	.51	. 48	94.	. 48	.51	•42		•29
N	3	S	. 40	• 43	•34	(L)	.37	• 32	.37	• 26	• 20	• 26
η,	•	4	•23	•23	•23	•17	•23	• 20	.17	7.	90.	90.
• •	N .	N 1	•	•00	90•	0	•03	•00	•0	•		000
0 1	-	7	•	+0•-	+0°-	•	+00-	80°-	•		•	12
~	0	0		-•20	23	CA.	26	23	20	- • 26	23	26
6	~	-	•	45	*	4	42	45	•	*	•	39
0	0	•	•	0000	•	Q	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	800	0.0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				•								
		RUN NO	11	K = .0497		DELT AA =	6.03	MEAN AA	MEAN AA = 18.00			
V X	18.00	16.44	14.98	13.73	12.77	12.17	11.97	12.17	12.77	13.73	14.98	16.43
, :						UPPER	SURFACE					
	7	1.7	-	-	71	1.6	-2.22	7	3	-4.76	5	7
0.		60.4-	-3.77	-3.61	3.5	-3.93	-4.73	-5.79	-6.75	~	-8-88	-10-16
0	3.3	3.1	2.8	~	2.9	3.3	-3.93	4	5	•	6.7	- 7
0	1.9	1.6	-	-	2.1	2.2	-2.73	7	3	•	104	•
	-		~	15	7		-1.42	6	2.	-2.24	2.5	2
~	9	0	21	84	1.2	-	-1.11	1	-	N	2.2	2.
7	6	8	94	81	1.	6.	-1.10	*	-	~	1.7	-
7		0	81	86			61	4	7	_	1.5	-
3	-	-	64	71	7	1.	71	6	1.	~	1.0	-
4	ŝ	9	66	62			73	7.		80	9	•
•	*	-	43	*L. -			60	*	•	50	.5	
-	-		52	86	78	9	41	.2	•	41		•
6	8	8	82	91		*	34	7	•	19	2	
	0	•	0000	0000	0000	0	00.0	00.00	00.00	00.0	0	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	-2.17	-		-1.46	71	-1.65	-2.22	-3.11	-3.91	- ∢	Š	_
0	0	7		• 50	• 50	•34	.15	23	61	-1.12	-1.63	-2.30
0		0		-92	. 86	-92	•	•		000	**	.32
0	~	•	•	•65	•65	.61	.69	•	.13	.76	. 63	••
~ •	9	•		• 50	14.	.43	.53	.63	.70	.77	. 83	.87
~ (4	•	9	•29	.33	• 59	04.	.47	• 54	.57	. 71	.71
V	Λ.	~		•19	• 5 9	• 19	•35	• 32	. 42	•	. 55	
~	-	~		•12	60.	•	•1•	• 5 9	.32	.37	:	*
~	0	0	o	•05	0	•	0	.17	•20	• 23	• 5 9	.35
4	•	0	•	03	0	•	•03	•00		•19	• 19	67.
•	~	•	•	~	12	12	0000	•	• 10	•0•	• 7 •	*1.
~	~			7	-	•	09	•	•0•	•03	• 03	.03
06.		30	33	30	29		31	8.0		05	05	-00
0	•	0	•	•	•	8.0	00.0	•	00.00	00.00	00.0	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

					COCCUMENT TO LONG	1000						
		RUN NO	7.8	K = .0754	DELT	1 AA =	90.9	MEAN AA	18.00			
AA	18.00	19.56	21.01	22.27	23.23	23.83	24.03	23.83	23.23	22.27	21.02	19.56
×						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	7	•	-5.18	-1.79	-1.37	-1.32	95	90	06*-	80	99•-	52
00	-11.75	-12.12	-2.44	-1.43	-1.22	-1.11	79	79	85	+10-	69•-	79
•05	~		-2.02	-1.31	-1.02	82	65	-•65	57	53	48	57
•05	-		-2.23	-1.46	-1.30	-1.18	93	96 •-	93	87	184	84
•10	8	•	-2.24	-1.25	-1.09	-,81	45	84.	53	-•31	20	-•26
•15	0	•	-2.68	-1.69	600	-1.24	88	97	-1.02	80	88	440-
•20	8	•	-2.51	-1.62	-1.20	-1.17	+6	*6 *-	91	85	81	78
•25	9	•	-2.34	-1.57	-1.16	-1,13	89	95	95	89	84	86
•35	7	•	-1.80	-1.50	-1.10	-1.10	87	06 •-	87	81	74	71
645	9	•	-1.55	-1.48	-1.16	-1,16	+6*-	96*-	87	80	73	69
09.	4	•	-1.30	-1.68	-1.19	-1.19	-1.02	86	84	77	77	70
.75	•22	•	97	-1.76	-1.16	-1.27	-1.12	-1.01	06*-	78	82	71
90	4	•	55	85	-1.15	-1.26	-1.03	97	91	85	82	67
1.00	0000	•	0000	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	00.0	00.0	000	000	0
						OMER	SHREACE					
•00	8.1	•	S	-1.79	-1.37	-1.32	95	06*-	06*-	80	99*-	52
•01	-2.87	-3.32	-2.04	29	+0 •-	•08	•30	• 34	04.	• 50	•59	•62
•05	0	•	•52	•68	•72	•80	•84	. 8	• 88	• 88	• 88	• 88
•05	.83	•83	•91	• 8 3	• 16	•72	.72	•72	•72	•69	•61	•61
•10	06.	• 93	• 90	•83	•70	•73	.67	•63	•63	•57	• 50	•
•15	•75	• 78	• 78	•68	.57	.57	• 50	.47	• 43	•43	•36	• 26
•20	• 64	•74	•68	• 58	. 48	• 45	•35	•38	•32	•29	•25	•16
•25	• 60	•54	• 60	.37	•29	•29	•20	• 20	• 18	•15	•12	•0
•35	•35	• 41	. 41	•23	•14	•11	•09	• 0 9	• 05	•05	0000	-00
• 45	•29	•25	• 25	90•	03	03	900-	90 •-	-•09	13	19	-19
09.	•14	•14	•10	+0•-	-•16	16	-•19	-•23	27	23	27	31
.75	.21	•00	•03	23	35	29	35	35	32	35	35	35
06.	08	08	13	45	59	53	56	56	53	50	50	140-
1.00	00.0	•	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	0000	00.0	00•0	00.0	00.0	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		3	87	A370- = X	ğ	1 4 4 E 19 2	70	**				
			2	ò	3		*0.0		MEAN AA * 10.00			
**	18.00	16.43	14.98	13.73	12.17	14.16	11.96	12.16	12.76	13.72	14.97	16.43
2						UPPER	SURFACE					
00		-1.09	1.0	-	1.7	•	-2.64		6	•	5.6	-6-88
•01		2.	-3.08	-3.40	-3.93	4.73	-5.37	-5.26	-6.91	-7.98	7	-10-58
0	8	2.	2.5	7	3.3		64.4-		3		6-8	-7-62
0	8	1.	1.8	-	2.3		-3.04		6		4	-4.52
~	•	•		96*-	0	•	-1.91		-	•	2.5	-2.74
~	6	•	6	-1.02	1.1		-1.69		-	•	2.2	-2.36
~	8	•	9	-•75		•	-1.26		-	•	1.4	-1.78
•25	6	•	9.	81	8		-1,22	•	-		1.5	-1.54
m	96	•	.5	•	ø		94		•	•	9	-1-14
13	9	•	9	•	3	•	26	•	•			62
09.	9.	•	-	46	•		39	•	•		3	50
-	9	•	1	•	10	•	03	•	•		3	- 3
0	7	•	5	64	•2		19	10	•		2	3
Õ	0	•	0	•	0000	•	00.0	•	00.0	00.0	0000	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
•		-1.09	0	-1.27	-1.70	-2.08	-2.64	•	•	-4.52	-5.61	•
•01	•62	•56	.53		•34	.21		19	51	66*-		-2.23
0		• 9 9	8	• 88	.88	. 88	88.	40.	•80	*9•	•	7
0	Š	3	3	•61	•65	• 65	•65	•72	•76	.80	•76	
~	4	3	3	040	14.	•53	•53	•63	19.	19.	.77	40
~ (N	2	2	•26	• 33	•33	04.	.43	.54	•61	• 64	.7
N	Ò	•00	_	•16	•25	•25	•29	•35	.38	• 45	.51	S
N		0		•00	•	•15	•20	•23	.32	• 34	•37	•
m.	7	7	0	•	•	•05	.11	•14	•17	•23	•26	.3
•	7	7	7	600-	90•-	•	•	•00	60•	•12	• 12	N
•	9		7	•	•	•	•	•05	•10	90•	•00	
~	4	32	2	•	•	14	05		•	•03	• 03	•
6	Š	3	6	22	16	•	•	-•05	00.0			0
0	Õ	0	•	•	•	•	•	•		0000	00.0	0

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	RESSURE	COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	42	K = .1027		DELT AA =	90•9	MEAN AA	18.00			
¥¥	18.00	19.56	21.02	22.28	23.24	23.85	24.05	23.85	23.24	22.28	21.03	19.56
						UPPER	SURFACE					
Ō	8.4	9.8	0.0	-1.98	-	-1.46	-1.07	88	79	64	04.	-•21
0	1.9	2.7	5.0	-1.60	-1.25	-1.20	•	-1.00	8		75	80
•05	-7.96	-8.07	-3.68	-1.34	-1.19	-1.26	+6*-	₩6 •-	83	68	54	72
0	4.8	8.4	3.0	-1.45	-1.27	-	97	-1.03	87	75	72	69
-	3.1	2.9	3.0	-1.81	7	-1.42	93	98	80	89	54	54
~	2.0	2.0	2.4	-1.70	-1.44	~	-1.01	-1.01	O.	+L	74	99
2	1.8	1.8	2.4	-1.64	~	~	88	88	8	73	99	63
~	1.4	1.5	2.3	-1.58	-	~	81	81	~	57	48	48
3	7.7	1.3	2.5	-1.82	~	~	-1.09	-1.03	0	80	71	190-
4	80	1.0	1.8	-1.93	~	-1.40	-1.22	₹6	8	80	69*-	62
•	9	-	1.5	-1 •86	~	_	-1.25	-1.08	0	87	70	74
~	ŝ	.5	-	-1.67	_	-	-1.18	95	88	84	80	72
6	0	-	.3	-1.20	82	76	89	69*-	S	52	59	35
•	O	•	Š	0000	0000	0000	00.00	00.0	0	•	00.0	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00.		9.8	0	-1.94	-1.84	-1.46	-1.07	86	79	*	04.1	21
0.	-3.07	-3.68	3.6		53	16	•00	• 20	.33	•	• * •	.67
0	~	•	•	.17	. 20	1.01	1.05	1.12	1.09	1024	1.12	1.12
0	•	0	•	: •05	.97	1.05	.97	.97	.97	*6*	•86	• 82
~	•	•	•	••	7	• 7.	.7.	.66	• 65	•61	•55	94.
-	~	•	.83	2.	2.	.69	.59	.53	64.	64.	•39	• 36
N .	•	•	99.	•••	• 56	. 50	.37	• 28	.28	.31	.18	. 18
~	41	•	-62	•6•		. 45	.34	.23	•26	.21	.13	• 10
	-	•	-	.35	.27		•0•	•	8	•03	0	07
•		•	.37	.31	• 7 •	• 15	•	•05	•05	90.	0	60
•	~	\sim	• 55	•15	•	\$	03	8:	•	0	~	17
-	0	0	.00	07	25	24	- 3	33	33	30	30	36
0	60	0	11	30	3	67	50	52	•	1	5	47
•	3	•	•	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	8	•	•	0	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	19	K = •1027		DELT AA =	90•9	MEAN AA	18.00			
AA	18.00	16.43	14.97	13.71	12,75	12.14	11.94	12.14	12,75	13.71	14.96	16.42
) X						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	26	-•12	17		88	-1,31	-1.79	-2,51	-3,32	-4.19	-5,33	-6.17
0	80	-1.20	-1.40		-2.54	-3.77	-4.56	-5.36	-6.30	-7.43	-8.92	-10.30
•05	64	86	-1.23		-2.76	-3.23	-3.77	-4.32	-4.94	-5.59	-6.39	-7.16
0.05	66	69	81		-1.97	-2.34	-2.68	-2.98	-3.29	-3.69	-4.11	-4.54
•10	49	49	68		-1.37	-1.81	-2.05	-2.20	-2.40	-2.64	-2.79	-2.98
.15	61	61	92		-•79	-1.27	-1.53	-1.62	-1.83	-1.92	-2.09	-2.14
•20	57	57	76		44.	98	-1.20	-1.26	-1.42	-1.49	-1.68	-1.77
.25	45	94	1.48		17	72	90	-1.00	-1.12	-1.21	-1,33	-1.39
.35	+90-	55	55		42	94	77	93	96*-	-1.03	-1.12	-1.15
.45	62	48	59	52	34	27	55	66	69	73	80	80
090	63	09	+1		50	22	29	50	46	940-	57	57
•75	61	57	65		50	38	12	19	-,19	23	31	-,31
06*	28	25	•01		+00-	•39	•15	•32	•35	•28	• 22	•15
1.00	0000	0000	00.0		0000	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000	000	0000	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00	26	-,12	17	-•36	88	-1,31	-1.79	-2.51	-3,32	-4.19	-5,33	-6.77
• 01	190	•73	•73	•10	.51	• 36	•17	-•03	***	87	-1.55	-2.21
•05	1.16	1.16	1.09	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.09	1.01	• 93	•73	•53
•05	•19	•75	.67	•75	•75	•75	• 86	• 90	.97	1.01	.97	1001
•10	• 42	• 48	•39	•36	•39	• 45	•52	• 58	• 65	.71	.78	•81
•15	•59	•36	•19	•19	•25	•29	•39	• 43	640	•59	•63	• 69
•20	•12	•00	• 00	•05	•00	90•	•18	• 28	•31	• 40	**	• 53
• 25	•01	•0•	40.	40.	•07	•01	•18	•26	•26	•34	.37	. 48
• 35	07	07	-•10	-•10	+00	-•01	•03	• 03	•21	•24	•24	• 32
• 45	600-	60	06	600-	900-	-•03	•0•	•12	•18	•25	• 25	• 58
09.	24	-10	17	14	900-	03	00.0	.11	• 18	•15	• 18	•25
• 75	33	30	27	-•30	24	-•19	-•10	-01	•01	.01	•03	•03
• 90	41	-•36	- • 36	-•33	27	17	08	00.0	• 05	0000	03	0000
1.00	0000	00.0	0000	0000	00.0	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS	PRESSURE	E COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	0	K = .1284		DELT AA =	6.07	MEAN AA	1 = 18.00			
√ ×/∨	18.00	19.57	21.03	22.29	23,25	23.86	24.06	23.86	23.25	22.29	21.03	19.57
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	8.4	9.9	6.0	7	2.5	2.0	-1.12	-1.07	-	•	09	09
0	1.1	2.2	13.1	•	1.7	1.6	-1.25	-1-00		•	00-1-	-1.26
•05	-7.56	-8.10	-8.25	-4.32	-1.88	-1.55	-1.19	46-1	-1.05	06		-1.05
0	4.6	4.9	4.8	9	1.8	1.6	-1.27	*6*-	-		87	-1.03
~	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.	2.2	2.1	-1.52	-1.03	7	•	83	-1.08
~	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.	1.8	1.7	-1.22	92	-	•	-1.74	92
~	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.	1.7	1.8	-1.30	92	-		82	82
~	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.	1.6	1.6	-1.21	87	•	75	66	690-
m.	1.2	1.2	7.04	2.	1.9	1.9	-1.38	-1.03	-	96*-	84	07
	0	6	1.1	1.	1.7	1.8	-1.43	-1.08	•	•	67	76
9	9	9		-	1.8	1.7	-1.69	-1.25	-	•	16	70
~	ě	4	5	•	104	1.5	-2.05	-1.52	1.		91	57
6		.2	.3	•	1.1	1.0	-1.47	-1.30	•	-1.03	90 -	65
0	0	0	0	•	0	9	00.0	800	•		00.0	8
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0	4	6	•	-7.20	-2.27	-2.03	7	-1.07	-1.22	19	60	60
0	3.1	3.8	4	2	8	•	7	•	7	•33	.45	7
0	~	•	25	•		•	1.05	1.09	1.09	0	1.09	1.09
•02	.97	16.	•	1 • 09	1.05	1.05	0	1.01	16.		•	.79
-	8	O	*6*	•	.91	.84	.71	.71	99.	5	. 52	.45
~	~	~	•83	1.03	.93	•76	•59	• 56	.53	4	.36	•29
2	5	ø	69.	•72	•	• 56	04.	.37	.34	~	. 18	.12
N	.51	S	• 62	•62	S	. 48	•34	• 20	• 56	_	• 10	•0
•	•	3	***	.41	n	•24	•12		•12	0	07	-10
•	6	S.	• 40	04.	N	• 25	•00	- 1	• 00	0	09	16
Ð	~	•15	• 25	• 15	┛	.07	7	•	7	7	24	24
	•03	0	90.	•03	~	•	6	•	.3	3	36	%
000	600	900	9000	410	7.57	000	090	740-	64.	100 100 100	- 55°	740-
•	?		•	>	•	•	•	•	•	3	•	3

ISTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENT

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	RESSUR	COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	80	K = .1284	DELT AA	* **	6.07	MEAN AA	- 16.00			
*	18.00	16.43	14.96	13.70	12.74	12.13	11.93	12.13	12.74	13.70	14.96	16.42
è						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	1	1	6	55		88	-1.22	09	-2.27	-3.23	į	-6.20
0	1.4	0	2.9	-2.83	2.73	-2.83	-3.23	-3.97	-4.61	-5.70		-0.72
0	1.1		4	-2.32	2.39	-2.54	-2.61	-3.34	-3.45	-4-17		-6.32
0	1.0	0	1.6	-1.64	1.67	-1.85	-1.97	-2.31	-2.56	-3.01		-4.00
~	0	7	1.0	-1.12		-1.42	-1.56	-1.76	-2.01	-2.25	-2.59	-2.79
~	1.0	•	-	02	1010	990-	43	-1.01	-1010	-1.35	-	3
•20	92	88	63	50	54	76	82	95	-1.01	-1.33	-1.49	3.7-
~	1	-	5	45		48	51	63	72	-1.00	-1.10	-1.30
3		. 7	9	61		61		71	3	***	-1.03	-1.0
4	1.	5	9	99*-			73	99*-	•	62	69	
•		-	9	57		04	63	09			50	53
7	•	9	•	94		*:	16	50		*	31	34
•	•			45		30	10	35	•	15	21	21
0	•	0	0	00.0		800	0000	8.0	•	0	00.00	8
						LOBER	SORPACE					
00.	79	79	96	55	.94	:	-1.22	0	-2.27	-3.23	-4.52	-6.20
•	•	•	24.	**:	19.	.5.	~**	• 20	8.0	67		2:1-
• 05	1001	1.01	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.05	.97	•	.57
•0•	.75	.67	.71	.71	.71	.71	.73	. 79	.82	*	. • 7	1.01
• 10	.39	.32	.39	• 36	.36		640	.52		••	. 71	=
.13	.26	•	.22	• 10	. 5.	• 7.	2.	.29	. 39	•	*	-
• 50	•	•	0000	00-0	-05	•0•	-12	\$	• 1 •	. 20	. 37	:
\$2	•	•	00-0	-05	-05	•07	.07	• 10	•1•		**	•
.35	•	•	13	10	10	3	3	.00	8	.12	. 21	. 30
•	•	•	13	•1•-	•0•-	•0•	8	?	\$	•13	•1.	. 25
9	32	20	21	***	17	10	10	10	•0•-	•	.01	11.
. 75	•	•	- 30	30	27	10	13	13	•1•-	100-	•0•-	01
0	•	•	30	33	27	22	•1•-	-1	17	•0•-	•0•-	-00
3	•	•	0	000	0	000	0.00	8	8	00.0	8.0	0000

		RUN NO	81 K	(= .1589	DELT AA	H	90•9	MEAN AA	= 18.00			
¥	18.00	5	21.03	22.29	23.26	23,87	24.07	23.87	23,26	22.29	21.04	19.57
×/c						UPPER	SURFACE					
	;					-1.84	-1.31	-1.36	-1.41	-1.22	-1.12	-2.32
	-8.21	-10.12	12011-			-1.84	-1.45	-1.30	-1.20	-1.15	-1.00	-1.25
- 10	66.01-	-12.83	06.61-	7 62	-2-12	-1.63	-1.34	-1.05	-1.08	-1.01	79	97
	-1.38	91.0	1000			1,64	-1.39	-1.12	-1.09	-1.06	84	-1.03
	09.4-	-5.03	-5.28			70	74.1	-1.27	-1.22	86	78	-1.03
	-3.03	-3.28	-3.28			0001-	1	77	70	1.57	-1.35	-1.44
	-2.23	-2.44	-2.57			1707-	0001-	200	1011	90	70	-682
	-1.83	-1.96	-2.15			-1.77	-1.23	1001-	1101		04	- 663
	-1.49	-1.61	-1.76			-1.82	-1.12	00.1-	7101-			4
	-1-15	-1.31	-1.41			-2.08	-1.47	-1.22	-1012	-1.00		,
	0	1001	-1.08			-2,17	-1.40	-1,33	-1.15	-1011	1001-	000
			48.			-2.37	-1.69	-1,32	-1,11	-1.18	*6	000
	0					-1-33	-2.17	-1.48	-1.06	-1e06	66	76
	1.34	040				12	-1.57	-1,33	- 89	72	65	52
	•15	100	100				000	00	0000	0000	0000	0000
	0000	•	0									
						LOWER	SURFACE					
						,		1.36	-1-41	-1.22	-1.12	-2032
00.		•	•		-3045	001-	•	16	1 1 2	50.	41.	- 13
•01	-3.14				-1.58	710-		010	100		1001	1001
•05					640							00
405	160				1.13	1.09		* * *	160			17
	-87	76.	1.04	1.00	1.00	•91	.71	• 65	00	•	•	1 7 6
	040				.93	• 19		• 56	640	•	•	9.00
	200				•72	99•		. 34	16.	97.	17.	
2 6	2				.67	.51		•29	• 56	. 18	910	
25	0 0				14.	•32		•03	•15	-001	100-	
	• 0				44.	• 31		00.0	90•	900-	-003	900-
640	-00				115	21		32	24	35	35	32
090	00					- 19		30	30	39	36	16
•75	*0°) (38		60	140-	55	64	799-
06.	03							0000	00.0	0000	0000	0000
1.00	0000				•	•		•				

•	S
i	COEFFICIENTS
3	•
ì	-
	=
7	_
- 1	~
	-
	-
	•
•	Ä
	9
,	J
-	u
•	×
	PRESSURE
-	n
	S
1	u
-	ĸ
-	1
	S
•	3
i	5
ì	ш
-	₹
-	7
1	=
1	-
:	>
-	TANTANEOUS
,	7
	12

		RUN NO	81	K = .1589	DEL	DELT AA =	80.9	MEAN AA	= 18.00			
*	18.00	16.42	14.96	13.70	12.73	12,12	11,92	12,12	12,73	13.69	14.95	16.42
, ,						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	-1.55	-1,31	-1,31	-1,12	88	79	-1.17	-1.79	-2,61	-3.75	-5.14	-6.53
00	-1.69	-1.69	-2.24	-2.73	-2.63	-2.68	-3.18	-4.17	-4.96	-6.15	-7.58	-9.12
•05	-1.41	-1.37	-1.81	-1.88	-2.21	-2.32	-2.76	-3.41	-4.10	-4.79	-5.70	-6.58
•05	-1.18	97	-1.21	-1.58	-1.67	-1.73	-2.07	-2.43	-2.83	-3.23	-3.72	-4.21
•10	86	-1.08	440-	83	-1.08	-1.27	-1.66	-1.91	-2.20	-2.35	-2.69	-2.84
•15	-1.75	-1.53	-1.40	-1.01	96	-1.09	-1.18	-1.62	-1.83	-1.92	-2.18	-2.23
•20	-1.11	88	79	99	54	60	88	-1.07	-1.23	-1.42	-1.55	-1.74
•25	69	090-	-•60	54	-•32	38	51	75	-1.00	-1012	-1.30	-1,36
•35	77	64	58	68	55	48	58	64	90	99	-1.09	-1.15
.45	55	73	52	62	55	-,52	45	41	59	73	80	80
09.	67	70	94	63	47	53	12	46	-,36	50	53	57
•75	42	65	34	50	50	38	12	31	-027	-•19	23	-027
06.	25	21	-•11	08	08	21	01	•39	.05	•25	• 25	•25
1.00	0000	0000	0000	00.0	0000	0000	0000	000	0000	0000	0000	0000
							2747013					
						LOMER	SURFACE					
000	-1.55	-1.31	-1.31	-1.12	88	79	-1.17	-1.79	-2.61	-3.75	-5.14	-6.53
• 01	.48	•27	•33	.45	•54	•58	•42	•23	10	65	-1.31	-2.11
•05	1.09	1.05	1.09	1.05	1.16	1.09	1.05	1.09	.93	.97	.81	.53
•05	•86	• 86	.75	• 19	.67	17.	.82	• 94	*6*	.97	1.05	1.01
•10	•52	•52	• 42	66.	•36	•29	.48	.52	• 58	•71	.81	.81
•15	•39	•29	• 29	•29	•26	• 26	•29	•39	94.	•56	• 69	.79
•20	•15	•15	•00	•00	90•	• 02	•00	•15	• 25	.37	*	• 50
•25	•01	•15	•01	•0•	•05	*0	•	•18	•26	.37	.43	. 48
• 35	07	-•01	+0- -	07	-•10	07	+0-	• 03	•12	•24	• 30	•35
• 45	900-	90	900-	-•09	90•-	90	00.0	90•	•12	•31	•31	•31
•60	32	21	28	28	28	28	24	90	0000	•01	•01	.07
•75	33	22	27	-•30	24	22	22	100-	*0	•03	• 00	•03
060	36	33	33	- 36	33	27	19	900-	40	•05	•05	0000
1.00	000	00.0	00.00	00.0	00.00	0000	0000	00.00	0000	00.0	0000	000

ISTANTAMEDUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTAN	INSTANTAMEOUS PRESSURE	ME SSUR	E COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		NON NO	82	K1589		DELT AA •	•0••	MEAN AA	1 - 10.00			
**	18.00	19.91	21.03	22.29	23.26	23.07	24.07	23.87	23.26	22-29	22.04	19.57
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0	7.3	•	0.3		- (4	-1.00	-1.79	-1.53	~	•	83	74
0	0	2	13.9	•	~	-1.74	-1.53	-1.47	_	8-	•	-1.26
0	7.5			-	-2.68	~	-1.30	-1.43	-1.09		92	~
0	4:5	3	2.5	•	N	-1.4	-1.53	-1.50	~	16	91	-1.06
• 10	-3.14	-3.25	-3.31	-3.36	-2.82	-1.56	-1.67	-1.34	• 56	52	57	68
~	2.5	2	2.8	3	•	~	-2.47	-2.10	6.	-	-1.07	~
2	1.0	-	2.0	7	~	~	-1.00	-1-4	37	1.	- 90	-1.8
~	1.6	-	1.8	~	4	~	-1.83	-1.51	53	-	98	98
3	1.3	7	1.4	~	~	\sim	-1.65	-1.40	63	-	-1.17	92
	•	•	6	~	~	-1.85	-1.36	-1.18	37	-1.18	94	72
•	Š	•	~	82	~	~	-1.47	-1.30	51	-	99	65
-	4	•	5	68	82	~	-1.00	-1.37	45	7	7	79
6	•	•		-1.01	-1.18	~	-1.96	-1.57	-1.47	-	-1.37	-1.27
0	0	•	Ŏ	0000	0.00	0000	00.00	800	00.00	0000	00.00	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
0		8	0.3	66.6-	N	-1.88	-1.79	-1.53	-1.18	-1.09	83	*L*-
•01	-2.67	-3.59	-4.42	-4-10	-1.12	000	43	20		•29		.52
0	0		4	38	•39	.51	•58	.78	.78	.82	• 85	.82
0	9	•91	•	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.05	16.	-87	*	•
~			Ŏ	1.07	1.04	.91	18.		.75	• 65	*	.53
~	0	• 96	0	1.10	1.06	96•	1.06	.78	.61	.61	\$	*
N		•82			• 68	• 79	•63	• 60	.53	:	.31	•28
N	S	•62	-	•73	• 68	.57	• •	. 41	•27	•30	-17	.11
m.		•52	• 58	\$.55	?	-32	•29	.17	•11	8.0	03
•	3	.42	٠	94.	•45	•23	•17	•17	.01	01	07	13
۰		.32	m.	•36	•36	•16	•03	•03	01	11	22	1
-	2	•22	•25	•25	•13	•	17	15	23	23	35	32
6	7	•	7	•10	00.0	27	\$.	33	41	64	55	\$
Ó		8	0000	00.0	0000	•	0000	8	8	000	000	8

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

	16.42		-5.72	-8.85	-6.42	-3.98	-2.76	-2.38	-1.69	-1.51	-1027	83	58	39	69	0000		-5.72	-1.67	.39	1.02	.81	. 78	.63	• 38	•35	•26	.21	. 16	*0*	0000
	14.95		-4.23	-7.36	-5.63	-3.61	-2.49	-2.15	-1.57	-1.48	-1.14	79	61	39	69	0000		-4.23	98	. 70	.98	.75	.71	. 53	• 38	. 29	•23	.21	.10	*0*	0000
	13.69		-3.19	-6.14	-4.84	-3.18	-2.27	-1.96	-1.44	-1.30	-1.08	65	48	31	65	0000		-3.19	29	.74	.91	69.	.61	*	•30	•26	•20	• 14	.10	*0*	0000
MEAN AA = 18.00	12,73		-2,32	66.4-	-3.65	-2.80	-1.72	-1.77	-1,31	-1.15	67	58	34	31	82	0000		-2,32	.16	.82	.87	.62	.61	.43	•25	• 20	.17	.07	*0*	*0*	0000
MEAN AA	12,12		-1.62	-4.17	-3.48	-2.49	-1.72	-1.54	-1.09	-1.09	76	41	48	42	72	00.0		-1.62	.39	. 95	.87	64.	14.	.31	.19	.08	• 05	.07	00.00	•05	00.00
90*9	11.92	SURFACE	-1.18	-3.29	-2.97	-2012	-1.45	-1.35	87	74	51	51	34	24	85	0000	SURFACE	-1.18	.57	.89	.65	04.	.37	•25	•08	00.0	01	•03	03	08	00.0
DELT AA =	12.12	K	92	-2.89	-2.51	-1.68	96*-	-1.02	62	48	57	30	51	64	82	0000	LOWER	92	.80	.89	.87	• 30	04.	. 12	•03	03	01	03	900-	11	0000
DEL	12,73		99*-	-2.62	-2,34	-1047	74	74	62	62	73	58	65	64	91	0000		66	.94	.89	•69	• 33	•30	.19	•0	03	+00-	03	15	16	0000
1589	13.70		99*-	-2.62	-2.11	-1.65	63	74	37	65	79	65	65	09	78	00.0		66	.71	.93	69.	.37	.33	.09	01	03	+0	14	20	22	00.0
82 ×	14,96		83	-2.89	-2.45	-1062	74	88	99	74	82	62	41	46	91	00.0		83	.75	.89	.76	• 56	• 33	.19	•03	08	13	14	23	22	0000
RUN NO	16.42		-1.09	-2.28	-2.00	-1.09	-1.07	-1.40	87	80	73	58	65	71	-1.11	00.0		-1.09	99.	1.09	-87	.43	04.	•25	90.	03	13	18	26	33	0000
	18.00		92	-1.94	-1.32	-1.31	25	-1.54	-1.09	-1.09	-1.08	79	68	75	-1.08	00.0		92	.48	.89	.76	94.	•61	•25	90.	05	16	18	29	38	0000
	¥×¢		000	•01	•02	•00	•10	.15	• 20	•25	•35	.45	09.	.75	06.	1.00		00°	.01	•05	•00	.10	•15	• 20	•25	9.35	.45	09.	.75	06.	1.00

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

	RUN NO	83	K = .1910		DELT AA =	6.11	MEAN AA	1 = 18.00	0		
18.00	19.58	21.05	22.32	23.29	23.90	24.10	23.90	23.29	22.32	21.05	19.58
					UPPER	SURFACE					
6.9	8.6	10.0	11.3	8.1	2.4	2.8	1.4	1.7	•	74	-
0.0	2.1	13.7	14.7	8.1	1.7	2.2	_	1.5	_	66	•
7.1	8.1	6.8	8.9	5.1	1.8	2.0	_	1.4	_	75	•
4.4	4.9	2.5	4.9	3.9	2.2	2.0	_	1.5	_	68	-1.00
5.9	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.8	2.4	2.0	_	1.5	_	57	i
1.7	1.9	2.1	3.5	4.6	3.3	2.7		2.6	1.4	-1.77	1.
1.7	1.9	2.0	201	3.1	2.1	2.3	_	1.4	_	-1.00	-1.03
1.5	9.1	1.1	2.0	2.8	5.6	2.5	_	1.6	_	98	71
1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.9	2.5	2.3	_	1.5	_	-1.30	98
-	8	6	•	1.3	2.0	2.1	_	1.4	_	-1.29	06*-
Š	Š	•	-	7	1.5	1.5	_	1.3	_	-1.20	69
		.5	•5	9	1.	1.9	"	1.3	97	-1.04	82
9	~	8	ç	0	~	1.4	_	1.7	-1.40	-1.24	-1.18
၁	0	Š	•	0000	•	9	0000	•	0.00	00.0	00.0
					LOWER	SURFACE					
6.9	8.6	10.	11		2	2.8	2	-1.79	_ 7	47.7	100
2.4	3.6	-4.5	5		7	1.2		900-		20	•
7	.3	.5	09	22	•	.3	.51	.78	.78	78	. 82
O.	8	0	.80	• 95	.91	0	.87	.87	48.	.73	.76
•	0	80	.91	*6 *	*6*	0	.72	•62	•59	.53	64.
•	€0		96•	96•	96•	0	•75	.61	•58	4.4.	04.
9	~		.79	• 85	• 19	~	• 50	4.4.	•38	• 35	•28
S.	S	• 60	09.	•65	• 65	•	•33	.27	•25	.17	•11
4	4	94.	64.	640	• 46	•	•20	• 08	•05	00.0	03
(1)	(1)	• 36	• 36	•36	• 26	N	90.	04	+0	07	100-
2	N	• 25	•21	• 25	• 25	-	07	18	22	18	22
~	~	•13	•13	•10	.07	°	32	-•38	32	32	29
0	0	•	0000	90•-	•	7	64	57	-1.18	38	36
9	•	•	00•0	000	•	•	000	00.0	0000	00•0	00.0
		20	2.92	6.94	6.94	6.94	8.00 19.58 21.05 22.32 23.29 23.90 6.94	8.00 19.58 21.05 22.32 23.29 23.90 24.10 23 6.94 -8.68 -10.08 -11.39 -8.16 -2.49 -2.084 -2.0	8.00 19.58 21.05 22.32 23.29 23.90 24.10 23.90 23.00 19.58 21.05 23.22 23.29 23.90 24.10 23.90 23.00 19.58 24.05 24.10 23.90 23.00 24.10 23.90 23.00 24.10 23.10 2	8-00 19-56 21-05 22-32 23-29 23-90 24-10 23-90 23-29 22-3 0-9PER SURFACE 6-54 - 86.66 - 100-06 - 11-39 - 8-16 - 2-49 - 2-84 - 2-40 - 1-79 - 1-6-2 0-07 - 12-10 - 13-79 - 14-74 - 8-17 - 1-6-74 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-24 - 8-6.6 - 100-06 - 11-39 - 8-16 - 2-49 - 2-86 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 3-20 - 3-25 - 3-31 - 3-55 - 2-49 - 2-86 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 3-20 - 3-25 - 3-31 - 3-65 - 2-27 1-25 - 1-6-6 - 1-74 - 2-17 - 1-6-7 - 2-21 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-6 - 1-74 - 2-17 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-25 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-26 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-27 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-28 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-29 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-6-7 1-20 - 1-	Beach 19.58 21.05 22.32 23.90 24.10 23.90 23.25 22.32 21.00

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	9 3	K = .1910		DELT AA =	6.11	MEAN AA	MEAN AA = 18.00			
**	10.00	16.42	14.94	13.68	12.70	12.09	11.89	12.09	12.70	13.67	14.94	16.41
						UPPER	SURFACE					
000	•	4	-1.53	-1.44	7	0	-2,23		3		-5.02	~
.01	-1.13	2.	3	-3.77		-4.51	-4.72	-5.19	0	9	9	-9.66
•05	•	2.0	2.6	~	3	5	-3.93		4.7	.2	-6.14	0
•0•	•	1:4	1.3	~	2.4	3	~		3.1	3.0	3	~
•10	7	1:1	1:0	~	1.6	7	~	•	2.1		2	Ž
•15	7.6	1:0	1:1	~	1.3	6	65	•	6	1.0	-	•
•50	•	7.0	1:0	61	1.0	7	~	-	1.3	1.5	-	-
• 55	7.0		1:0	83		•	-1.15	•	3		-1.48	Ň
.35	1.2	-		61.	~		96	-	1.0	1.1	-	~
•••	1.1			***-	*	3	62		~	.7	76	~
0		Š		20	•		37	•		*	51	Ň
.75	-	~	Ç	10	.2		31	•	3	6	31	3
•	0	7.	-	56	9	9	69			9		•
8	2	•	3	0000	000	•	0000	0000	0000	0000		0000
						9	2043013					
						LOWER	SURLACE					
8		-1.00	-1.53	-1.4	-1.79	-1.97	-2.23		-3,19	-3.89	-5.02	•
.0.		.39		•29		•20	_	90	34		1.	-2.08
-05	•••	•		.78	- 82	• 8 9	-82	. 70	99•	•	•	.23
00	. 73	• 6 9	•	• 6 5	•	69.	• 16	00.	10.	120	.91	.95
0	•	64.	•	.43	4	.43	94.	• 56	.62	69.	.75	. 81
.15	04.	•		.37	4	04.	**	.51	.58	.61	. 68	. 82
• 50	- 22	• 1 •	~	•16	~	.22	• 28	.35	. 4.1	14.	• 60	99.
-25	. 11	•0•	0	•0•	•	•	.17	• 52	.27	•	. 41	. 52
. 35	•	09	•	03	0	.02	•05	.17	.23	• 59	.37	.37
•	•	13	-	01	•	•	10.	.11	• 1 •	~	• 23	.36
•	•	10	-	11	~	•	07	•10	.07	.21	.21	.25
.73	•	20	~	12	0	•	03	.07	• 05	-	• 10	.13
•		22	19	11	•	03	03	8	•	0	• 0	• 10
1.00	•	00.00	•	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	8.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	0000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

		RUN NO	4	K = .2279		DELT AA =	6.13	MEAN AA	= 18.00			
¥,	18.00	19.58	21.06	22.33	23.30	23.92	24.12	23.92	23,30	22.33	21.06	19,58
\ \ \						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	ŝ	-8.07	-9.73		-9.64	-2.49	-2.23	-2.40	-1.09	-1.01	-1,36	-1.27
00	0	-11049	-13.86		-11.28	-5.26	-1.53	-2.21	-1.67	-1.20	-1.60	-1.94
•05	7	-8.01	-8.86		-6.59	-3.65	-1.94	-2,23	98	-1.09	81	-1.55
•05	-4.39	-4.76	-5.20	-5.23	-4.20	-3.58	-2.09	-1.78	-1,59	-1.06	-1.40	-1.28
•10	0	-3.09	-3.25		-4.07	-4.13	-2.43	-3.03	-1.78	74	96 •-	79
•15	9	-1,77	-2.47		-4.91	-4.34	-3.74	-3.78	-3.41	-2.05	-2.05	-1.91
•20	7	-1.88	-2.01		-2.57	-3.24	-2,92	-2.04	-1,88	-1,38	-1,16	-1.19
•25	Š	-1.68	-1.74		-2.27	-3.04	-2.36	-1.86	-1,83	-1.59	-1,21	-1.27
935	2	-1.30	-1,36		-1.59	-2,22	-2,82	-1,71	-1,55	-1.62	-1.24	-1.05
.45	8	87	06*-		-1.01	-1,39	-2.52	-1.71	-1,25	-1.29	-1.11	97
090	3	58	58		68	54	-1,30	-1,88	-1.47	-1.16	-1.09	66°-
•75	69	35	45		53	64	79	-1.29	-1.55	-1.55	-1.18	75
90	ŝ	75	72		88	86	-1.01	-1,31	-1.86	-1.80	-1.63	-1.24
1.00	့	0000	07.0		0000	0000	0000	0.00	00.00	0000	0000	00.0
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	•	-8.07	-9,73		-9.64	-2.49	-2.23	-2.40	-1.09	-1.01	-1,36	-1.27
•01	-2.40	-3,36	-4.23	16.4-	-3.91	-1.48	-1.07	70	•20	•16	• 16	•39
•05	•23	03	42		45	•43	•43	• 70	.85	• 89	• 89	1.01
•05	1.09	1.05	86.		1.05	1.20	1.13	1.16	1.09	• 95	• 95	• 95
•10	1.00	1.07	1.10		1.13	1.13	1.07	.97	.81	• 78	69.	•65
015	1.03	1.06	1.10		1.16	1.10	1.10	1.06	.82	•68	• 71	• 58
•20	.82	.85	*6*		1.01	• 98	• 94	• 19	•63	44.	440	• 38
•25	.68	•68	• 76		.81	.79	.73	.57	44.	•30	•27	•25
935	*58	•61	• 64		•73	.67	•55	• 43	• 50	•17	•14	•02
.45	750	e 4 8	•54		•57	• 54	.48	• 36	•26	• 0 2	01	•01
090	040	040	.43		.47	040	• 36	•07	•14	07	14	11
•75	•27	•27	• 33		•27	• 25	•19	60	23	20	26	26
060	•21	•21	•21		•13	•10	•0•	30	52	41	- 38	- 33
1.00	0000	0000	00.00		0000	0000	0.00	00.0	0.00	0000	00.0	000

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTA	NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	PRESSUR	E COEFFICIENTS	IENTS				
		RUN NO	48	K = .2279		DELT AA =	6.13	MEAN AA	1 = 18.00			
4	18.00	16.41	14.93	13.66	12.69	12.07	11.87	12.07	12.69	13.66	14.93	16.41
						UPPER	SURFACE					
00•	.7	6	1.0	-1.01	7	7	7	1.4	1.9	2.7	3.8	5
0	1.3	1.9	2.9	0	2.6	2.9	3.1	3.6	4.5	5	9	
0	7	1.3	2.5	-2.11	3	2.5	8	_	8	4.3	5.4	9
0	1.1	1.2	1.6	9	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.9	3.4	
-	T	1.2	4	9	6	0	1.2	1.7	1.8	7	4	2
-	1.8	1.5	1.0	5	.2	1.6	2	~	5	9	8	
2	1.1	1.1	1 . I	6.	1	7.	-	0	7	1.3	4	
•25	-1.27	-1.15	-1.21	95	71	41	62	89	-1.12	-1.27	-1.39	-1.51
3	1.2	1.0	6	8	7.	-	4	•	6	1.0	1.1	
4	6	-1	5	3	9.	9	5	7	4	9	9	
9	8	9	•5	84	.5	3	4	6	4	6	4	
~	-	1.	3		.3	*	9	.2	6	6	.2	
6	7.	0	8	8	69*-	7.	8	æ	1	-	•	
0	0	0	0	00.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	O	
									'	'	1	
						LOWER	SURFACE					
00•	+L	9	0	-1.01	74	47	41	-1.44	9	1	-3.80	5
0	•61	9	•71	99•	ø	~	• 84	.57	•2	0	•	-1.53
0	.97	0	9	.93	9	3	1.01	16.	0	9	.82	
0	48.	Ø	8	•76	.73	.73	-87	•84	6	0	1.09	1.13
_	• 59	4	4	04.	4	4	.53	•56	Ŷ			.91
-	• 51	4	4	04.	4	4	74.	•51	.61	1	• 85	96.
2	•31	2	2	•16	2	7	•31	• 35	44.	5	99•	.76
• 25	.17	•17	• 08	90•	.11	.11	•17	•25	•35	***	64.	•54
m.	0	0	0	9	0	0	90°	•14	2		.43	.52
4	0	0	0	٠	•	•	• 05	• 08	•20		•33	.42
•	7		7	11	0	0	•03	• 07	~	~	.32	.36
-	20	~	_	-	0	0		• 02	_	-	•22	• 30
•	7		•	11	0	ç	08	03	~	$\boldsymbol{\vdash}$	•13	.21
0	0	0	0	9	0	0	•	00 • 0	0		00.0	0.00

INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS

				INSTA	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS	PRESSUR	E COEFFIC	IENTS				
		RUN NO	85	K = .2664		DELT AA =	6.17	MEAN AA	A = 18.00			
AA,	18.00	19.59	21.08	22.36	23,34	23.95	24.16	23.95	23.34	22.36	21.08	19.59
, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>						UPPER	SURFACE					
00	-5.63	-7.11	-8.77	•	-11.04	-6.94	-2.84	-1.79	-1.79	-1.27	92	99*-
• 01	-8.98	-11.22	-13.32	'	-13.32	-5.33	-2.14	-1.53	-1.40	-1.26	92	92
•02	-6.59	-7.79	-8.64		-7.56	-4.67	-2.45	-1.60	-1,43	98	75	92
•05	-4.01	19.4-	-5.13		-4.33	-4.82	-3,33	-2.06	-1.40	-1.22	88	-1.00
•10	-2.65	-3.03	-3.20		-3.74	0404-	-3.47	-3.58	-1,34	-1.34	68	63
•15	-1.54	-1.73	-2.29		-5.79	-4.95	-5.93	-4.20	-3,55	-3,18	-2.47	-1,49
•20	-1.63	-1.79	-1,91		-2.35	-2.70	-3,39	-2.83	-2,39	75	040-	600-
•25	-1,51	-1.65	-1.71		-1.98	-2.39	-3.54	-3.45	-2,77	-2.63	-2.33	-2.12
•35	-1,17	-1.24	-1,30		-1.43	-1.59	-2.41	-3.04	-2,38	-1,81	-1.20	98
• 45	72	79	83		760-	97	-1.64	-2.52	-2.41	-1.78	76°-	83
090	41	48	58		65	65	78	-1.54	-2.54	-2.16	-1.47	89
•75	39	940-	940-		09*-	57	09*-	64	-1.15	-1.98	-1.87	-1.40
06°	10	07	10		20	39	36	-°26	940-	91	-1.70	-1,31
1.00	0000	0000	0000		00.0	0000	00.0	0000	00 00	0000	0.00	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
000	-5.63	-7.11	-8.77	-10.25		+6.9-	-2.84	-1.79	-1,79	-1.27	92	99•-
•01	-1.94	-2.81	-2.08			-2.81	-1.25	80	43	•20	.34	150
•05	643	.09	26			0000	.51	• 58	.74·	1.09	. 85	.85
•05	1.09	1.27	1.16			1.13	1.20	1.13	1.05	1.05	86.	.87
•10	1.00	16.	.97		1.10	1.13	1.10	1.00	.97	•85	• 65	•62
•15	66°	1.03	1.13			1.16	1.13	1.06	66.	.85	•61	• 54
•20	.79	.88	.91			1.01	*6	.82	• 19	• 60	.41	•35
•25	•65	•68	.71			• 19	.73	• 65	•54	44.	•19	•17
•35	•52	•61	•61			• 64	•61	• 55	040	•20	• 05	.11
045	• 48	• 48	•51			.57	.51	•39	•29	•11	04	•02
090	•36	•36	•36			•36	• 29	•21	.10	11	22	- 33
•75	.27	•27	•25			•25	•16	•01	00.0	23	38	32
06.	.15	•13	• 13			•04	0000	03	-,16	140-	63	640-
1.00	0000	000	0000			0000	000	0.00	0.00	000	000	0000

NSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE COEFFICIENT

				INSTAN	INSTANTANEOUS PRESSURE	PRE SSUR	E COEFFICIENTS	LENTS				
		RUN NO	60	K2664		DELT AA .	6.17	MEAN AA	. 18.00			
∀	18.00	16.40	14.91	13.63	12.6	12.04	11.63	12.03	12.65	13.63	16.91	16.40
						UPPER	SURFACE					
0				**	3			•	1.7	7.6	7	
0	•	6	9	-2.2	2.6	2.8	7		5	5		
•05	-1.04	87	-1.09	-1.38	-2.40	-2.74	-2.91	-3.19	-3.70	~	0	. 0
0	6	8		-1.0	1.4	1.9	7	•	2.6	2.9		
-	9	4.	*	2	3	1.1	6		1.8	2.0	9	
-	6	.3	-	-1.1	••	3.9	9	•	1.0	2.2	1.6	
N	6	8		7	•	.7	6.		1.2	1.3	1.4	
•52	0	0	8	8 -	8	9			1.1	1.2	1,3	40
•	6	8	~	7	8	1	9		8	1.0	1	
•	-	~	1.	9	5	9	4	•	.2	5		
ø	9	5	.5	5	4	4	4	•		, "		300
-	0	5	ŝ	9	4.		5			``		-
9	-	7	2.	1		7	0		0	0	` '	21
o	9	•	•	0	Ş	3	0	•	00.0	00.0	0000	0000
						LOWER	SURFACE					
(1	,										
0 ((1)	31	31	48	57	7-94	83	-1.18	1	4	.2	
0	7	∞ ∙	• 89	•84	•75	8	.71	9	3	.2	9	-1.35
0	0	σ,	9	16.	16.	Ø	16.	9	0	.89	0	
Э,	90	80	_	• 16	•76	8	• 80	8	6	0	1.05	1.09
01.	•26	64.	• 46	• 46	94.	.53	94.	•62	69•		00	76
4 (0	4	4	04.	04.	4	***	4	5	~	. 85	96
N	m.	2	2	•22	•25	8	.31	3	4	5	.76	27.
V	~	-	7	•11	•11	H	•17	2	3	B	64.	5.7
m.	9	•	0	•05	•05	0	•11	_	N	3	643	
* .	9	0	0	•	•	0	•05	0	2	3	39	14
0 1	7	7.	7	•	•	0	•	0	_	2	• 29	.32
- (N	17	7	12	03	0	00.0	0	_	~	.22	. 27
2	7.	7	7	•	•	•	•	0	_	-	• 15	221
00-1	0	•	0	•	•	0	•	0	00.00	00.00	0000	00.0
))

Security Classification							
	ROL DATA - R & D	the executions at a classified.					
(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified) 1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Wind Tunnel Operations Department Unclassified							
University of Maryland							
College Park, Maryland							
	ODGEG ON AN OGG						
MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC FO	ORCES ON AN OSCI	LLATING AIRFOIL					
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Final Report							
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)							
Richard I. Windsor							
6. REPORT DATE	74. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	75. NO. OF REFS					
March 1970	237	38					
MA A TO 2 4 7 C OOL 2	SA. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT N	UMBER(#)					
DAAJ02-67-C-0017 b. PROJECT NO.	USAAVLABS Tech	nnical Report 69-98					
Task 1F162204A13903							
6.	this report) Universi	ty of Maryland Wind					
	Tunnel Engineering Report 70-1						
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT							
This document is subject to special expon	t controls, and eac	h transmittal to foreign					
governments or foreign nationals may be Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories. F							
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY A	CTIVITY					
		on Materiel Laboratories					
	Fort Eustis, Virgin	nia					
13. ABSTRACT							
A literature survey was conducted to determine the state of the art of measuring and predicting aerodynamic characteristics of oscillating airfoils. Results of							
this survey are presented as a correlatio							
wing experimental investigations. An extensive bibliography resulting from the literature survey is also presented.							
increased survey is also presented.							
Aerodynamic forces on a two-dimensiona	l NACA 0012 airfoil	oscillating sinu-					
soidally in pitch were measured by two te	chniques. The fore	ces were obtained from					
pressure measurements and by means of	strain gage balance	s. Pressure measure-					
ments were made on the airfoil oscillating							
at various mean angles of attack. Strain gage balance readings were obtained for models with pitch axis located at 25, 37, and 50 percent chord points oscillating							
about various mean angles. Test results obtained by the two measuring techniques have been compared with one another, with incompressible thin airfoil theory, and							
with previous experimental oscillating air	rioil investigations.						
Instantaneous pressure distributions are	presented for repre	sentative oscillating					
conditions.							
RR POR 4 4 79 REPLACES DO FORM 1475, 1 JAN 64,	Phile II						
DD	Un	classified					

Security Classification

Unclassified

Security Classification						CONTRACTOR OF CO
KEY WORDS	LIN		LIN		LIN	
Airfoil	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Symmetrical Profile			1			
Pitching Oscillation						
1 Iteming Obermation						
		1				
			-			
					F	
						. "
			1 1		1	

Unclassified